

law that would require the Department of Agriculture to render on request to an inventor of an agricultural implement an unbiased opinion as to the merits of the implement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3363. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of New England Traffic League, of Boston, Mass., and New England State Tax Officials' Association, urging that freight revisions be left with the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, January 6, 1925

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 807. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and confirm by patent in the nature of a deed of quitclaim the title to lots in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 1762. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands within Taos County, N. Mex., known as the Santa Barbara grant, by exchanging therefor timber, or lands and timber, within the exterior boundaries of any national forest situated within the State of New Mexico;

S. 2559. An act to establish an Alaska game commission to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds, in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 3058. An act giving the consent of Congress to a boundary agreement between the States of New York and Connecticut; and

S. 3584. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 27. An act to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for timber and interest in connection with the settlement for the Minnesota National Forest;

H. R. 64. An act to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended;

H. R. 2716. An act to amend paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code as amended by act of November 23, 1921, entitled "An act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2858. An act for the relief of certain customs employees at the port of Philadelphia who served as acting customs guards during the war emergency;

H. R. 3847. An act granting a certain right of way, with authority to improve the same, across the old canal right of way between Lakes Union and Washington, KKing County, Wash.;

H. R. 3913. An act to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States;

H. R. 5417. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Mo., commemorative of the Battle of Westport, October 23, 1864;

H. R. 5481. An act to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of July 31, 1918, in favor of certain employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.;

H. R. 6651. An act to add certain lands to the Umatilla, Wal-lowa, and Whitman National Forests in Oregon;

H. R. 6860. An act to authorize each of the Judges of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii to hold sessions of the said court separately at the same time;

H. R. 8263. An act to authorize the accounting officers of the Treasury to pay to certain supply officers of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve Force the pay and allowances of their ranks for services performed prior to the approval of their bonds;

H. R. 8965. An act for the relief of the Omaha Indians of Nebraska;

H. R. 9162. An act to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code, relating to appeals in admiralty cases; and

H. R. 9435. An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 88. An act for the relief of Louis Leavitt;

S. 225. An act for the relief of Edward N. McCarty;

S. 335. An act for the relief of John T. Eaton;

S. 368. An act for the relief of Nelly McCanna, residuary legatee and devisee under last will and testament of P. F. McCanna, deceased;

S. 511. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the Board of Regents of the University of Arizona, State of Arizona, of Tucson, Ariz., for a certain described tract of land;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of F. J. Belcher, jr., trustee for Ed Fletcher;

S. 2187. An act for the relief of Mrs. John D. Hall;

S. 2510. An act for the relief of William Henry Boyce, sr.; and

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Christina Conniff.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	King	Robinson
Ball	Fernald	Ladd	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Shipstead
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	Frazier	McLean	Smith
Bruce	George	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Gerry	Mayfield	Stanfield
Butler	Glass	Means	Stanley
Cameron	Gooding	Metcalf	Sterling
Capper	Greene	Moses	Swanson
Caraway	Hale	Neely	Trammell
Copeland	Harrell	Norbeck	Underwood
Couzens	Harris	Norris	Wadsworth
Cummins	Harrison	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pepper	Warren
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Phelps	Watson
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Weller
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Willis
Edwards	Kendrick	Ransdell	
Elkins	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Montgomery County, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of legislation providing for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3853) granting a pension to Kate D. Winslow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3854) granting a pension to John M. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 3855) to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of certain lots in the town of Cedar City, Utah, for the use and benefit of a small band of Piute Indians located thereon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 3856) granting an increase of pension to Augusta M. Pike (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3857) granting a pension to Eugene Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3858) authorizing the President to appoint George T. Swasey, jr., formerly a lieutenant commander, United States Navy, to his former rank as lieutenant commander, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 3859) to authorize the transfer of the title to and jurisdiction over the right of way of the New Dixie Highway to the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3860) granting a pension to Patrick Brosnan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 3861) for the relief of Charles M. Rodefer; to the Committee on Claims.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. HOWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 2858. An act for the relief of certain customs employees at the port of Philadelphia who served as acting customs guards during the war emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5481. An act to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of July 31, 1918, in favor of certain employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6551. An act to add certain lands to the Umatilla, Wallowa, and Whitman National Forests in Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 9435. An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8263. An act to authorize the accounting officers of the Treasury to pay to certain supply officers of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve Force the pay and allowances of their ranks for services performed prior to the approval of their bonds; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3847. An act granting a certain right of way, with authority to improve the same, across the old canal right of way between Lakes Union and Washington, King County, Wash.; and

H. R. 5417. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility, and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Mo., commemorative of the Battle of Westport, October 23, 1864; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 27. An act to compensate the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for timber and interest in connection with the settlement for the Minnesota National Forest;

H. R. 3913. An act to refer the claims of the Delaware Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; and

H. R. 8965. An act for the relief of the Omaha Indians of Nebraska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 64. An act to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended;

H. R. 2716. An act to amend paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code as amended by act of November 23, 1921, entitled "An act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes";

H. R. 6860. An act to authorize each of the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii to hold sessions of the said court separately at the same time; and

H. R. 9162. An act to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code, relating to appeals in admiralty cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1898) reclassifying the salaries of the postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I intend to vote to pass the postal employees' increased salary bill notwithstanding the President's veto. My reasons, briefly stated, are because the public favors the payment of increased sal-

aries, the postal employees need the increased pay, and the best interests of the Postal Service require it.

This measure was studied for months by committees of the Congress. It passed almost unanimously both branches of Congress, there being but 3 votes in the Senate and 6 in the House recorded against it. It has been almost unanimously supported by the public sentiment of the country. The Literary Digest in May last stated that 97 per cent of the editorials reaching its office favored an increase in postal salaries. Even such conservative papers as the New York Times said:

There are not many who would begrudge them the \$2,400 a year they are asking.

The Chicago Tribune said:

There is no reason why we should ask postmen to accept honor in lieu of groceries or their equivalent.

The Philadelphia Ledger said:

Employees of the Postal Service are underpaid and overworked.

These quotations express the public sentiment of the country.

But what has happened to bring about a new opposition that now threatens the defeat of this measure? A presidential veto.

The President's veto message is a contribution to the discussion of the merits of this question. But is it conclusive? Is it sufficient to justify the Members of the Congress in abandoning the solemn judgment they practically unanimously rendered on this question a few months ago? Review all that is before us, our earlier studies and votes, the condition of the Postal Service, the President's message, and yet I submit there is another obligation greater than that of reaffirming our previous judgment or of supporting the President's veto. It is the obligation to view this question in the light of justice, justice that is so characteristic of the American people.

Let me put the issue in another way. In the name of economy shall we deliberately continue to visit an injustice on our postal employees? The postal employees have a special right to demand justice of us, for they are in honor and duty bound to forego the usual defense of wage-workers against injustice. They are barred from setting about obtaining an increase in pay in the manner of labor unions. They must work and wait until the Government sees fit to give them the compensation to which they are entitled.

A review of some facts, many of them undisputed, may help us to determine this question in the light of justice.

Of all the Government employees engaged in administering the various functions of government our postal employees are among the most efficient and faithful. There is certainly no class of employees working under more exacting superintendency and personal responsibility considering their number. No class of Government employees are required to work so hard; theirs is a ceaseless grind. They differ from most other classes of Government employees in this respect: In addition to being required to possess a substantial and good general education, physically sound, selected under a strict merit system, and perform within a given time a measured amount of work; more than this, and unlike other Government employees in the same general sphere of occupation, they must possess a moral stamina sufficient to resist the ever present opportunity to steal and grow careless in the performance of duties which to them are routine but to the public consequential. In a word, we exact from them a very high degree of efficiency and a high measure of personal honor.

Other Government employees and clerks paid practically the same wages under the law are given 30 days' vacation and 30 days' sick leave each year without loss of wages. The postal employees receive 15 days' vacation leave and 10 days' sick leave only per annum without loss of wages.

In addition a large number of postal employees must work in the open under all climatic conditions, suffering the fatigue of summer and the exhaustion of storms and cold of winter. These employees must buy their own uniforms, and in view of their exposure their wearing apparel must be a good deal heavier and therefore an item of expense which other Government employees do not have to pay.

They must be men whom other men respect and men of unquestioned integrity. In places outside of the largest cities the whole community is acquainted with them. They are constantly under observation. The least infringement of the rules of the service or misconduct is readily reported.

In addition, the undisputed figures show that there has been an increase in the cost of living in the United States since the pre-war period of about 70 per cent, while during the same period the wages of the postal employees have been increased only about one-half this amount. It does not take

a very high degree of intelligence to recognize the fact that the wages which we are paying to this class of faithful Government employees to-day are inadequate and insufficient to meet the simplest needs of their families.

Economy is being practiced in the Post Office Department only upon the poorer paid employees, for under the reclassification of salaries act, operative since July last, 11 employees in the office of the Postmaster General receiving from \$2,000 to \$5,000 have had their salaries increased on the average of nearly \$1,000 each. In the office of the First Assistant 5 have had their salaries increased an average of nearly \$1,000. In the office of the Second Assistant 6 have been given increases averaging \$1,000. In the office of the Third Assistant 7 have been increased, and in the office of the Fourth Assistant 4 have been increased on the average of \$1,000 each.

The pay which letter carriers, postal clerks, and other postal employees are receiving to-day is inferior to that prevailing in most other callings requiring similar training and application. On March 7 last there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon my request a chart prepared by a Government official showing the percentage of increase in wages paid in 1923 over 1913 in various skilled and unskilled trades. This chart shows that the wages of bricklayers, carpenters, granite cutters, hod carriers, machinists, painters, plumbers, and structural iron workers have all been increased at least 70 per cent, and more than 100 per cent in some cases. During the same period United States postal employee's wages have been increased about one-half the amount paid before 1914.

Mr. President, how can we justify this record? Is the Government to lag behind private employers in the payment of living wages and providing satisfactory working and living conditions for those employed?

Mr. President, I decline to be responsible for denying these faithful employees a decent living wage. I refuse to permit the deterioration in the public service that such discrepancy between wages paid by private employers and the Government is certain to bring to this very important branch of the public service. I decline to permit men of character, integrity, good judgment, general ability, possessed, as they must be, with patience, intelligence, and pleasing personality, to be subjected to temptations to graft in order to clothe and feed their children and permit them to enjoy the same comforts of life as the children of American mechanics.

If we continue this policy of underpaying those who have grown up in the service, through force of necessity they will remain with us, but the capable and ambitious young man who ought to enter will shun it.

Mr. President, this salary-increase measure is not based on sentiment nor on graft. Neither is it a matter of partisan politics or party regularity. It is a matter of simple, down-right justice. The public, no more than the private individual, can get good, honest work and efficiency without paying for it. We can not get physically sound, dependable men, men of probity and intelligence, in this or any other branch of the Government service and pay them less than hod carriers and railroad section hands, mechanics, and domestic servants.

If we believe our Postal Service needs high-grade employees—men and women who love their job and are loyal to their employers, the American people—we should be willing to pay them a decent, living wage.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the President's veto, but I shall have the satisfaction of having voted that justice be done our efficient and faithful postal employees.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, I have had no thought of taking part in the discussion of the so-called postal salary bill. So far as the issue carried in that bill is concerned, there is little incentive to come to its defense, because the opposition to it has been so slight as hardly to take form against it. That the salary increase is not only justified on grounds of common business equity but that it is essential to the high standard of service which the public welfare demands has been clearly demonstrated. The favorable reports of the committees and the unanimous approval of both Houses of Congress have proclaimed the conviction of the legislative branch of the Government to an extent for which there is hardly a precedent in so important a matter. Finally, the conclusions of Congress respecting the increase of postal salaries were accepted with general and generous approval by the country. Therefore there is no occasion for defense of an issue which by itself apart has been so forcefully sustained and so universally indorsed.

But, Mr. President, that is not the whole question with which we find ourselves confronted to-day. We face a collateral

issue which has grown so great as well-nigh to overshadow the main subject matter. The Chief Executive of the Nation has interposed his veto. That is his constitutional right, his unquestionable and unquestioned prerogative. The veto was consistently in line with the announced economic policy of the Chief Executive. That it was prompted by the highest motive for the common good no man doubts. Adverse criticism of the veto is scarcely heard above the acclaim of approval with which the public accepts this added evidence of steadfast adherence to announced convictions on the part of the President.

Mr. President, I trust I have stated fairly the facts on which the pending issue rests; and now I ask: What is the issue before us to-day? Statements of it have been made which in the final analysis bring it to nothing short of a question of loyalty or lack of loyalty to the President. With those statements I take issue. It may not be to the least degree a matter of loyalty to the President. I am treating this phase of the matter without consideration of the constitutional authority under which a Member may vote to override a veto, an authority and a privilege in every sense similar to the authority and the privilege by which the Chief Executive invokes the veto. I am treating it purely as a matter of personal and, if you prefer, of political loyalty as between the legislators and the Executive. I deny that the assumption is based on truth and that this is a question of personal or political loyalty to the President. I deny this chiefly because I know that a man may be devoted to the President and ardently desire his political welfare and yet be compelled by his interpretation of every rule of honor to override the veto.

I believe in preelection pledges. I believe in the right of the electorate to ask of any candidate seeking its indorsement, "Do you believe in this or that, and will you or will you not advocate it and vote for it if you are elected"; and I believe that any candidate should answer such inquiries squarely and with no intention of evasion. I believe in political pledges to this extent, that, having given any part of his constituency to understand that he will enlist in any cause, he should not only go into battle but stay until he is driven from the field. Therefore, I affirm that any man who is bound in honor to any cause can not be released from it by any conflicting influence whatever, even though proclaimed in the garb of loyalty. He who betrays his sworn loyalty to another to respond to your cry of loyalty to you does that which wipes out your faith in him forever. No; there is no interchange of loyalty. That quality goes straight on and draws its substance only from the cause which gave it being.

Now, I want to make it clear that the President has never so much as by intimation urged with me the false appeal, so unnatural to him, of personal loyalty.

Tremendous pressure has been brought to bear upon men to sustain the veto that is pending. It has been clearly indicated that the President would use the power of his official position to accomplish it; that presidential approval and patronage and political standing would be denied or bestowed as punishment or reward for conduct in respect to a veto. With all that I take issue. I take issue with it chiefly because of my high estimate of the character of the Chief Executive.

Senators, I realize this is not the place, nor is it my purpose here, to make any effort to speak in high praise of the President; but, standing as he does in the whitest light that beats upon any man in the world to-day, I affirm that the mere fact that such conduct is at all attributed to Calvin Coolidge is the nearest to an accusation against him that has ever been attempted by man or organization that would overthrow him.

No! Of all the arguments which might influence my vote, the suggestion, even, that Calvin Coolidge would make despotic use of arbitrary power to such an end is so false to him, so unnatural to his character, that it has the least weight of all in any influence on my vote.

I am speaking of conditions as they confront me; and I will make it clear that I sense the fact that there are men in the Senate who may not vote as I shall vote whose course is guided by influences just as high as those by which I am trying to steer my craft. It may be my misfortune; my motives may be misinterpreted, and by some distorted; but here is pending legislation which to my mind is imperative for the public welfare, for which I have labored literally for years, and for which I have protested to hundreds of my constituents that I would do my utmost. I am confronted with the possibility that this legislation may this day go into the scrap-heap, and with the question as to whether I shall give my vote to send it there. All this, and much more like it, rises as an obligation which I must meet straight out or become a deserter.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. President, in my mind which will not down, and which compel me to vote to-day for this legislation, the veto of the President notwithstanding.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, it is always unpleasant when we can not agree with our associates, and also unpleasant to deny our friends what they ask. This, however, is simply a business proposition, and should be treated as such.

When I took my seat in the Senate I was assigned to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Since that time I have endeavored in every way in my power to advance the service, to aid the employees, and to pass the best possible laws for the public in general.

We all remember at the last session the great propaganda that was organized for this increased pay. I want to say that I am one of those who do not believe that the pay of our postal employees should be governed by the receipts of the office. We would all like to see the income sufficient to take care of the outgo, and I believe that a few years since such was the case. In 1918, however, an increase was granted the postal employees, another increase was granted in 1919, another in 1920, and now this bill asks for an increase of something like \$68,000,000 per annum.

To my mind, the rule which should regulate and fix the compensation of employees would be one that would provide just, equitable, fair, and even liberal compensation for the service. It would not do to say that an employee should get no pay, or small pay, because the department in which he worked was not remunerative to the Government—for instance, in the Navy Department or the Agricultural Department. On the other hand, it would not do to contend that the employees should receive all that came in, because that would be an unjust rule; take the Treasury Department, for instance. The employees, however, should be paid fairly and liberally, and when we undertake to see whether or not they are thus paid we have to compare these employees with other employees of the Government. That should not be the absolute rule, however; but another way of getting at it would be to compare what these employees get with what people receive who are employed in similar occupations in private life. I do not believe they should be held down to what is paid in private life, because it takes a high degree of intelligence to perform the duties in the Post Office Department; it takes some technical training, and I am perfectly willing to pay the employees there somewhat more than is received by employees in private occupations.

That being true, Mr. President, we shall have to look to see whether or not this increase is justified. The argument before our committee was that the natural increase of the post-office receipts would soon cover the increased pay; and it was further argued that if the increase was not sufficient, the fact finding commission was investigating the cost of the service, and that at this session we could pass a bill increasing and regulating and evening up the charges on the different branches of the service. These were the reasons why I voted for the bill.

I am disappointed to find that the first argument has not been sustained by the facts. We find a deficit of something like \$24,000,000. We see, from figures with regard to 100 of the largest post offices in the United States, that on the average there is no increase, but, on the contrary, there is a falling off of over 1 per cent.

I received a telegram from my own State which says:

The receipts of the Columbia post office were reduced \$13,000 on second-class postage during the past year. It was only during about six months of the year that the newspapers diverted to express and automobile as much of their circulation as they could.

It shows that the patrons of the office are patronizing trucks, express, and other methods of transporting the mail; so I am sorry that the income did not increase.

On the other hand, we have received the report from the fact finding commission, and it shows that the receipts are uneven in different departments. In fact, some of the charges are ridiculously low. No one is going to enjoy having the expenses of his business increased, but I feel that we should pass a bill equalizing rates and putting them on a fair basis. To my mind the Post Office Department needs overhauling generally.

For instance, take the residential sections of cities. I can see no reason why they should have three or four deliveries a day; to my mind two deliveries would be enough. Also, in the business sections of cities they perhaps could have less deliveries than now. Then take the rural carriers. Under the law some of these routes are 4, 6, 8, and 12 miles. The longest, I believe, is about 24 miles. The Government has spent enormous sums of money to improve our highways, and when these routes were laid off they were much shorter. The roads were bad. Now,

since we have expended these large sums in making transportation easier and cheaper, I feel that many of those routes should be consolidated and that, in other words, we should have fewer employees and pay them higher wages.

I am not in sympathy with many of the rules of the department; for instance, some of those not allowing employees to work after hours. I believe they should be allowed to do more work, in case they desire to do so, and thereby increase their pay. I do not want anyone turned out of office, but perhaps these matters could be taken care of as vacancies occur.

Mr. President, I feel that after we have investigated the subject, and after we have ascertained the facts, they do not justify passing the bill as we did at the last session. I am sorry they do not justify it.

The President of the United States in his veto message gives us certain statistics. I shall not take time to read those, but ask that they be inserted as part of my remarks, beginning with the statement of the case and the figures on page 2 and ending on page 3 where I have marked.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The postal service rendered the public is good. The service conditions under which the employees perform their duties are probably more satisfactory than ever before in the history of the Post Office Department. The Government has been solicitous of the welfare of postal employees. Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislative acts and adjusted to scales of pay as favorable as any in the public service. The act of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks \$200 a year and rural carriers \$240 a year. In addition, there were increases in compensation to a large number of the supervisory force. The act of November 8, 1919, further increased the compensation of postal employees from \$100 to \$200 per annum. This was followed by the act of July 5, 1920, which provided further increases in compensation ranging from \$200 to \$300 for clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks and \$260 for rural carriers. Substantial increases were also provided in the salaries of the supervisory force, ranging from \$200 to \$600 a year.

The effect of these increases in salary grades over those for the fiscal year 1918 was an increase of \$600 to clerks and carriers in post offices, \$500 to railway postal clerks, and \$600 to rural carriers.

By reason of these increases the Government has paid out during the fiscal years from 1919 to 1923 an additional aggregate of \$450,000,000 in salaries to postal employees above what would have been paid under the scale in effect before these changes, as follows:

During the fiscal year 1919	\$33,202,600
During the fiscal year 1920	68,901,000
During the fiscal year 1921	110,756,000
During the fiscal year 1922	114,256,000
During the fiscal year 1923	123,256,000

It is apparent that the Government has dealt generously with this service.

As a result of these readjustments the average salaries for 1923 are—

Post-office clerks, \$1,751, increase of \$919 since 1909, or 110 per cent.

Post-office carriers, \$1,752.83, increase of \$862 since 1907, or 96 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, \$2,107, increase of \$946 since 1907, or 81 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, including travel allowance, \$2,292, increase of \$1,131 since 1907, or 97 per cent.

Rural carriers, \$1,849.52, increase of \$1,140 since 1907, or 160 per cent.

The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from \$1,140 to \$2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately \$1,554 on July 1, 1924, under the provisions of the classification act of 1923. It is thus seen that the lowest average of the salaries of the postal employees in the field service is nearly \$200 more than the average for employees in the Government departments in Washington.

At the request of the committee which considered this legislation the Post Office Department made a special investigation of the range of salaries paid to persons employed in business institutions throughout the country and reported the results. These investigations covered representative cities ranging in populations from 2,000 to over 5,000,000. It was found that in all cases of employees of a similar character the average salaries paid were much lower than those paid in the Postal Service.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, until yesterday I had hoped that the veto message would be laid aside and that we would take up the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I do not claim that that is an entire solution of the problem. The rates need overhauling. There are too many printing presses issuing useless circulars. Where they are too

low they ought to be increased. I am sorry that we have not agreed to take up that bill. In case there should be errors in it we can correct them by amendments later.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIAL. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from South Carolina says he hopes the Senate will agree to the Sterling bill. Let me read to the Senator what the effect of the Sterling bill will be in one section of the country. Here is a telegram from the Arizona Republican—

Mr. DIAL. I hope the Senator is not going to take up my time.

Mr. ASHURST. Just two or three minutes. This telegram is from the Arizona Republican, one of the leading Republican newspapers of the Southwest, whose partisan loyalty to the President can not be challenged. The telegram is addressed to me.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, did the Senator say the telegram was addressed to him?

Mr. ASHURST. To me.

Mr. McCORMICK. My friend Mr. Heard is following the injunction of St. Paul to be all things to all men.

Mr. ASHURST. I contributed in a modest way to Mr. Heard's defeat as Republican nominee for governor, but he is a man of good character. It required the ablest efforts of the Democrats to beat him, and I am glad they did defeat him. But he knows enough to know that the Sterling bill is a miserable makeshift, conceived in cowardice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must make an announcement. We are operating under a 20-minute limitation.

Mr. DIAL. I hope the Senator will not take up all my time. I am willing to answer a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be compelled to hold that the Senator from South Carolina will lose the floor by permitting an interruption of that character.

Mr. DIAL. I hope to have a moment. The Senator can continue this matter in his own time.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Chair is going to rule that—

Mr. DIAL. My friend speaks well, but he will have to speak in his own time. I can not let him take up the balance of mine.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for the time he did yield to me.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, if we shall pass this bill over the President's veto it will have a retroactive effect, entailing the expenditure of an amount a little less than \$35,000,000. To my mind, retroactive legislation is always wrong. The Government could never know where it stood if such practices were permitted. There would be a difference of \$35,000,000 plus \$24,000,000 deficiency plus \$68,000,000 increase.

As to the Sterling bill, I want to say this: That perhaps that will be the best remedy we could adopt now, but I also want to say that if that bill is brought up now simply as a decoy, it is without my knowledge or consent. I am ready to vote on that bill without debate, with perhaps some amendment, at any time, and I insist that if it is the intention to use that as a decoy it is not fair, and it is not what I approve. I hope that such is not the case, because here we should deal frankly, fairly, and openly not only with ourselves, but we should deal frankly with the postal employees and with the country at large.

We hear some Senators speak of a surplus in the Treasury and about the income of the Government being so-and-so. They are deceiving no one except themselves. You might as well say that, although you owed \$1,000, because you had \$100 in the bank you could live riotously. This Government owes the money represented by its bonds, and it has to get the income to retire its bonds.

When we see wages being reduced in private enterprises and when we recall burdens already on the people we should act cautiously, with justice to all. Let us get together on an equitable measure.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me to read the telegram I started to read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield with great pleasure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee will remember that we are operating under a rule which limits debate to 20 minutes, and under which no Senator may speak more than once.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember that rule, but I do not expect to speak over five minutes, so I yield to the Senator for the purpose of reading the telegram.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I would not take the floor if it would deprive the Senator from Tennessee of his right to speak.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee yields to the Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. ASHURST. Resuming the reading of the telegram, which I attempted to read a moment ago:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., January 3, 1925.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Senator from Arizona, Washington, D. C.:

Our paper wishes to protest strongly against proposed Sterling bill, increase of second-class postage, which is so eminently unfair after all previous tremendous postage increases, and for reasons previously explained by us. Sincerely trust you can realize the eminent unfairness to newspaper publishers.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLICAN.

Ever since I entered public life the Arizona Republican has opposed my ambitions, and I have with some degree of success opposed the present editor of that paper; but at least he can see the injustice of the Sterling bill.

I hold no brief for the newspapers of the United States. They owe me nothing; I owe them nothing. I never have sought publicity from them. The only way in which they have ever mistreated me has been by overpraising me. I care as little as any man could care about whether my name be on the front page or the back page. I care only for that usual modicum of publicity which all politicians seek to obtain for nothing.

That telegram I just read came from the Southwest. Now, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, which states that the rates in the Sterling bill are ruinous.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS. January 4, 1925.

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

In its present form the postal bill, which would reduce postage on most newspapers, would increase domestic postage on the Christian Science Monitor from \$95,000 a year to \$239,000 a year, an increase of over 150 per cent. The Monitor is issued by the Christian Science Publishing Society, an unincorporated trusteeship auxiliary to the Christian Science Mother Church. The Monitor is published at a loss. If it produced net earnings they would accrue to the church, not to any individual. Under existing law the Monitor is exempt from zone rates because maintained in interest of religious organization and not for private profit. Zone system would be peculiarly burdensome to Monitor because its circulation, unlike that of most newspapers, is not local but is nation-wide. An amendment consisting of section 1103 of war revenue law would meet this situation. We request your cooperation in securing this amendment.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am opposed to the bill known as the Sterling bill, reported out by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] on January 2. I oppose it, first, because it was never really intended by anyone that it should be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield. I have only a few moments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was reported out for the purpose of giving weak-kneed Republican Senators some excuse for changing their minds on the postal salaries bill from what they believed last year. Last spring, by a vote of 73 to 3—20 not voting—the Senate of the United States passed a postal salary bill. The three Senators voting against it were Senators Fess and Willis, of Ohio, and Senator BORAH, of Idaho. Every other Senator, including the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], the author of the recent bill, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], who reported it, actively and vigorously supported the bill, or were impliedly for it, as this record shows. I desire to insert here the names of those who voted for it, the names of those who voted against it, and the names of those not voting, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert this in the RECORD.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to wait just a moment. I want to add right here that I am now going to read the names of the Senators who voted for the postal salaries bill last spring, and who yesterday repudiated that vote by voting to refer the Sterling bill back to the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I was about to ask the Senator a question on the very point he touched upon a while ago. When he inserts the names of those not voting for the bill, will he not also be kind enough to insert the announcements that were made during the roll call, which may throw some light on the attitude of those who did not vote?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will do that with great pleasure at the request of the Senator from Nebraska, and for an additional reason, namely, that it shows how many Senators actually felt about it. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to let the whole proceeding, including the pairing of Senators, appear as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings of the Senate, May 27, 1924)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. EDGE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). On the final vote on the bill I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERRIS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (when Mr. NEELY's name was called). The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent. A State-wide election is being held to-day in the State of West Virginia, and he is in attendance upon it. He is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. If present and at liberty to vote, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. McNARY. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent on account of official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STANLEY (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. STANLEY. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and state that if the Senator from Missouri were present, he would vote as I have voted. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BAYARD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. If he were present, he would vote as I have voted. So I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. PITTMAN. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. If the Senator from Colorado were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). In view of the statement of the Senator from Nevada, I am at liberty to vote, and therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCH] and let my vote stand.

Mr. RALSTON. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERRIS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 3, not voting 20, as follows:

Yeas, 73: Ashurst, Ball, Bayard, Brandegee, Brookhart, Broussard, Bursum, Cameron, Capper, Caraway, Colt, Copeland, Cummins, Curtis, Dale, Dial, Dill, Edge, Edwards, Fletcher, Frazier, George, Gerry, Glass, Gooding, Hale, Harrell, Harris, Harrison, Heflin, Howell, Johnson (Calif.), Johnson (Minn.), Jones (N. Mex.), Jones (Wash.), Kendrick, Keyes, Ladd, Lodge, McKellar, McKinley, McLean, McNary, Mayfield, Moses, Oddie, Overman, Pepper, Phipps, Pittman, Ralston, Rans-

dell, Robinson, Sheppard, Shields, Shipstead, Shortridge, Simmons, Smith, Spencer, Stanfield, Stanley, Stephens, Sterling, Swanson, Trammell, Underwood, Wadsworth, Walsh (Mass.), Walsh (Mont.), Watson, Weller, Wheeler.

Nays, 3: Borah, Fess, Willis.

Not voting, 20: Adams, Bruce, Couzens, Elkins, Ernst, Fernald, Ferris, Green, King, La Follette, Lenroot, McCormick, Neely, Norbeck, Norris, Owen, Reed (Mo.), Reed, (Pa.), Smoot, Warren.

So the bill was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now read the names of the list of 19 who changed their votes on this bill yesterday—Messrs. BALL, BURSUM, CAMERON, CAPPER, CUMMINS, CURTIS, DIAL, HALE, HARRELD, KEYES, MCKINLEY, MOSES, ODDIE, PEPPER, PHIPPS, SHORTBRIDGE, STERLING, WATSON, and WELLER. It will be noted that 19 of the Senators who voted last spring for the bill then called the Sterling bill voted to refer the same bill back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, thus repudiating the very bill they had previously supported and voted for.

Mr. President, last spring the President vetoed the bill, and this new bill was introduced and reported simply for the purpose, as we all know, of offering an excuse for some who are willing to change their votes at the behest of the President, or to have an alleged excuse for doing it. I want to say to those Senators that this bill affords no such excuse. If they would examine that bill, I do not believe a single one of the 19, without interference from the outside, would vote for the so-called Sterling-Moses bill.

Several years ago I took occasion to examine very carefully into the question of losses on second-class mail matter. I found then that there was a very great difference between the losses on newspapers, as a class, and the losses on magazines and other second-class mail matter as a class. In my judgment, the newspapers, under the then existing rates, substantially paid their way. Under the small increase of rates then made I am sure that they now pay their way. There should not be any increase through this bill in rates on newspapers, and I shall vote against any increase in rates on newspapers.

On the other hand, there is unquestionably a large loss on magazines and other kinds of second-class matter. Perhaps some bill ought to be passed in order to remedy defects in the rates on that part of second-class mail matter, but not this bill. This bill has not been given proper consideration. This bill has been reported out without consideration, hastily, as a makeshift, for the purpose simply of affording an excuse for Senators to change their vote, because of a presidential veto, and not for the purpose really of changing the rate, so as to benefit the country. There is not time in this session to consider such a bill; this should not be undertaken, and it will not be undertaken at this session. I have no doubt the Senate will vote this bill down, as it should be voted down. Some time in the future these rates on magazines and other forms of second-class matter will be considered on their merits, after giving all ample opportunity to be heard; but in no case should this half-baked measure, substantially disregarding the report of the expert committee, be adopted.

Mr. President, the officials of the Post Office Department who have been examining into the losses on various classes of mail matter have occupied, as I remember, something like two years in making their investigations, and here in two or three days a bill is reported out, undigested, without that care and scrutiny which ought to be exercised in the preparation of a bill, and without regard to the recommendations of the committee. Again, it is probably unconstitutional for such a bill as this to originate in this body; and yet we are asked to support an unconstitutional measure of that sort for the sole purpose of saving the feelings of the President.

Mr. President, I realize that we can not make every branch of the Post Office Department self-sustaining. That never has been so in the history of this Government and never will be so. First-class postage has always borne the great burden of the cost of the department, and has always paid its own way and more. Indeed, Senators, it has always largely more than paid its own way, and the records of the last year show that the Government made a profit out of first-class mail of more than \$80,000,000, and comparatively enormous profits have been made out of first-class postage ever since the Government began.

I ask unanimous consent here to insert in the RECORD a statement from the recent report, giving a table on page 189 as to the costs of the various services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement showing recapitulation of allocations and apportionments of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923, shown in Table A, according to the classes of mail matter and special services, and the loss or gain on each

Classes of mail matter and special services	Revenues	Expenditures	Loss	Gain
Paid first class	\$271,894,051.49	\$191,476,335.17		\$80,417,716.32
Second class	31,214,425.47	105,927,294.14	\$74,712,868.67	
Third class	43,844,940.77	60,136,516.25	16,291,575.48	
Fourth class	120,649,662.42	127,566,416.24	6,916,753.82	
Franked matter		357,819.45	357,819.45	
Penalty matter		6,214,131.44	6,214,131.44	
Free for blind		27,315.29	27,315.29	
Foreign	12,871,746.39			
Receipts foreign mail transit	115,419.03	17,591,003.59	4,603,838.17	
Money order	11,601,425.82	21,141,936.99	9,540,511.17	
Registry	8,005,579.20	18,379,593.01	10,374,013.81	
Postal Savings	5,409,504.00	708,092.95		4,701,411.05
Special Delivery	8,175,648.33	8,297,645.67	121,997.34	
Insurance	7,185,771.14	8,331,730.60	1,145,959.46	
C. O. D.	4,079,143.35	5,904,580.74	1,825,437.39	
Treasury savings		221,809.28	221,809.28	
Total	525,047,317.41	572,282,220.81	132,354,030.77	85,119,127.37
Loss, excluding unassignable and unrelated items			47,234,903.40	
Less unassignable revenues	7,773,776.74		7,773,776.74	
Net loss, excluding unrelated			39,461,126.66	
Unrelated	1,592,077.63	1,936,653.15	344,575.52	
Grand total	534,413,171.78	574,218,873.96	39,805,702.18	

Mr. McKELLAR. On the other hand, there has always been a deficit in the case of second-class postal matter. We have tried to make our Post Office Department as a whole self-sustaining, but, as a matter of fact, it has rarely been so. From 1800 to 1810 there was a small profit each year. In the year 1850 there was a very small profit. In the year 1918 there was a comparatively small profit; but outside of those years, in every year of our national history there has been a loss, or deficit, in the Post Office Department, which has been made up out of general taxation. So that when you are asked to make each and every part of the Postal System self-sustaining, when you are asked to make the whole of it self-sustaining, you are asked to disregard the history of the department from the beginning of the Government.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record another table showing the losses or gains in the department throughout the history of the Government, as shown on page 11 of the report to which I have referred, so there can be no doubt about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

GROWTH OF THE POSTAL SERVICE—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN YEARS FROM 1800 TO 1923

The growth of the Postal Service has been phenomenal. A comparison of the receipts and expenditures for certain years from 1800 to 1923 shows the following:

Item	1800	1810	1820	1830
Receipts	\$280,804	\$551,684	\$1,111,927	\$1,850,583
Expenditures	213,994	495,969	1,100,926	1,932,708
Excess of receipts	66,810	55,715		
Excess of expenditures			48,999	82,125

Item	1840	1850	1860	1870
Receipts	\$4,543,522	\$5,499,984	\$8,518,067	\$10,772,221
Expenditures	4,718,236	5,212,953	19,170,610	23,998,837
Excess of receipts		287,031		
Excess of expenditures	174,714		10,652,543	4,226,616

Item	1880	1890	1900	1910
Receipts	\$33,315,479	\$60,882,098	\$102,354,579	\$224,128,657
Expenditures	30,542,804	66,259,548	107,740,267	229,977,224
Excess of expenditures	3,227,325	5,377,450	5,385,688	5,848,567

GROWTH OF THE POSTAL SERVICE—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN YEARS FROM 1800 TO 1923.—continued

Item	1916	1917	1918	1919
Receipts	\$312,057,688	\$329,726,116	\$344,475,962	\$364,847,126
Expenditures	307,148,437	317,293,436	344,754,490	398,609,030
Excess of receipts	4,009,251	12,432,680		
Excess of expenditures			278,528	33,761,904

Item	1920	1921	1922	1923
Receipts	\$437,150,212	\$463,491,275	\$484,853,540	\$534,413,172
Expenditures	475,487,125	536,974,675	544,522,510	574,218,874
Excess of expenditures	38,336,913	73,483,400	59,668,970	39,805,702

¹ Exclusive of \$44,500,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.

² Exclusive of \$71,392,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.

³ Including estimated outstanding obligations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe the natural normal increase in the departmental business will within a year or two more than make up for the salary increase. It has always done it substantially. It will do it in the future. The post-office business is expanding tremendously every year. We have increased salaries very considerably in the last few years. We have raised the rates scarcely at all, and yet the revenues have been constantly increasing and making up to a very large extent the deficits and losses. For instance, in the year 1922 there was a loss of \$59,000,000 in the entire department. In 1923 that loss had been reduced by the sum of \$20,000,000, and I understand that this year the deficit will be practically wiped out. So if the bill is passed over the presidential veto, it will be but a short time before the deficit will be substantially wiped out as previous deficits always have been.

We should vote down the Sterling bill. It deserves an early death. We should override the President's veto on the salary bill. The President in his message stated that he is not opposed to the increase of salaries of the postal employees. His only purpose is to provide taxation to meet the additional expense. Practically all the Members of the Senate and all the Members of the House are in favor of the bill. The country is in favor of the bill. There is no reasonable excuse for any Senator changing his mind in regard to it, and I hope that Senators, especially the 19 whose names I have read, will upon the final vote feel that it is their duty to stand by their own convictions so solemnly expressed on the floor of the Senate in yea-and-nay votes and will vote to override the veto of the President.

I shall vote against the Sterling bill and I shall vote to override the President's veto.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an article from certain newspaper men showing that the deficit in the Post Office Department is not due to present newspaper rates. I regard this as a splendid article and I hope every Senator will read it in the Record to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

NEWSPAPERS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANNUAL DEFICITS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The many statements coming from various sources and unwittingly admitted, in a way, even by some of the publishers of newspapers, to the effect that the Congress of the United States and the Post Office Department in recognition of services rendered by the newspapers through the country had favored the newspapers in the matter of postal rates and thereby helped to create a large annual deficit in the Post Office Department, caused a member of this committee early in May last to begin an investigation of the subject, in which he had the courteous assistance of the Hon. John A. Moon, chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and also the willing aid of the officials of the Post Office Department.

What was discovered in May caused this member to feel that the statements in question were not justified by the facts, and hence upon his return to Washington in June he determined to resume his search for further facts, and therefore, on the 25th of June, submitted the following inquiry to the Hon. James B. Corridon, head of the Bureau of Railway Adjustments:

FACTS ELICITED

What does the department, under the space basis, pay to railroads for the use and service of 60-foot and 30-foot cars in length, respectively, for following distance, to wit:

Mail pay one way, 100 pounds, 60-foot car basis—

First zone, 50 miles, 0.12 $\frac{1}{4}$.

Second zone, 50 miles, 0.12 $\frac{1}{4}$.

Third zone, 300 miles, 0.56 $\frac{1}{4}$.

Assuming that the average weight carried per car aggregates 12,000 pounds per trip, what will be the cost to the Government per 100 pounds paid to the railroad on each of the above-mentioned distances? I do not mean include overhead charges or expenses incurred by the department in any other way in the above figures, but only what the department pays to the railroads under the space-contract system.

The cost, of course, to include initial terminal allowance to the railroads for each one-way trip, which, I presume, for example, should be added to each 300-mile haul; that being about the average distance of a one-way trip.

The Hon. Mr. Corridon, after having directed a careful investigation, had inserted under the head of "mail pay, one way, 100 pounds, 60-foot car basis," the figures opposite each of these three zones as shown.

In presenting this paper thus completed, as an answer to the inquiry, Mr. Corridon stated it should be borne in mind that on several of the roads, and particularly trunk lines running east and west, there were cars required on the trips westward which had to be returned empty, and upon which returned empty cars the mileage was paid for by the Government at the same rate per mile as though they were loaded, and that according to his best estimate these empties would represent not exceeding 40 per cent eastbound of the total number of loaded cars westbound, but he did not believe that many cars were returned empty in either direction on roads running north and south.

COST OF CARRYING MAIL FIRST 300-MILE ZONE

Allowing for 40 per cent of all cars returned empty would, on the basis of the figures of cost as given in the inquiry above referred to, fix the following mail pay, one way, 100 pounds, 60-foot car basis:

First zone, 50 miles, 0.17 $\frac{1}{4}$ per 100 pounds.

Second zone, 150 miles, 0.40 $\frac{1}{4}$ per 100 pounds.

Third zone, 300 miles, 0.78 $\frac{1}{4}$ per 100 pounds.

Making the average cost for the first two zones 0.29 cents per 100 pounds and for the three zones 0.48 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents per 100 pounds.

The suggestion has been advanced that the foregoing figures are erroneous, and that the estimate of the daily weight of mail carried upon which they are based will not average 12,000 pounds per car.

Assuming the daily average to be less than 12,000 pounds, it is equally true that the estimate of cost is based on the largest sized cars in use by any railroad and the highest price paid by the Government for the use of such cars. It is therefore not unreasonable to contend that in cases where the daily mail per car does not average 12,000 pounds, cars of less size are used. In other words, it stands to reason that the department would not employ the use of the largest cars and invite the largest cost, when cars of less size and less cost would answer the purpose.

We have, through the kindness of the department and the courtesy of the Hon. John A. Moon, chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, been furnished with a schedule of prices paid by the department for cars and space supplied by the railroads to the Government, as follows:

Rates of pay, Railway Mail Service, space basis

Class of service	Rate per mile	Initial terminal allowance for each trip one way
* Full railway post office cars 60 feet in length.....	\$0.21	\$4.25
Apartment railway post office cars 30 feet in length.....	.11	2.75
Apartment railway post office cars 15 feet in length.....	.06	2.00
STORAGE CARS AND STORAGE SPACE		
Cars 60 feet in length.....	.21	4.25
Cars 30 feet in length.....	.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apartment cars 15 feet in length.....	.05 $\frac{1}{4}$	1.06 $\frac{1}{4}$
CLOSED POUCH SERVICE		
Space 7 feet in length.....	.03	.50
Space 3 feet in length.....	.01 $\frac{1}{2}$.25

The foregoing exhibit indicates clearly that where the daily average weight per car may be only, for example, one-half, i. e., 6,000 pounds, the use of cars 30 feet in length should suffice and reduce the cost to the Government correspondingly, thus leaving the cost in 30-foot cars for 6,000 pounds weight at practically the same rate per

100 pounds that it would cost to carry 12,000 pounds in cars 60 feet in length. It also shows if the average weight should only reach 3,000 pounds per car, that a compartment 15 feet in length should suffice, and the use of the 15-foot space in such cases would again leave the cost to the Government at the same rate per 100 pounds. Indeed, this exhibit as to the cost of cars and space to the Government indicates that the Post Office Department under the act of Congress providing for the use of cars on a space basis has planned so wisely that even mail transported under the "closed pouch service" is being carried at a price that entails practically no greater cost to the Government per 100 pounds in having mail carried on the smaller roads or branch lines than the cost of having larger quantities of mail carried on trunk lines in the largest mail cars in use.

DEPARTMENT ENTITLED TO COMMENDATION

The Post Office Department, as we see it, is entitled to the highest commendation for having under the space contract system authorized by Congress planned to have the railroads enter into contracts whereby mail in any quantity may be transported by the Government for like distances at practically the same cost per 100 pounds.

The foregoing on either and all of the several bases of quantity of mail carried and cost to the Government, in so far as they apply to the first three zones of less than 300 miles, may therefore be regarded as a fair one of the cost to the Government, and since not more than 40 per cent of the circulation of the daily newspapers of the country is carried beyond the 150-mile zone, the fourth zone of 600 miles might be included in the 1 cent per pound rate now existing, and not exceed an average cost of 96 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds to the department against the \$1 per 100 pounds now being paid by newspaper publishers for transportation of papers within the first, second, and third zone of 300 miles.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS FAIR

But the publishers of newspapers are not asking that. Their aim is to be entirely fair to the Government, and will therefore be content with the existing rate of 1 cent per pound for a distance of 300 miles. The publishers, in fact, realize that there ought to be a readjustment of the postal rate on second-class matter; that is, there should be an advance in order to prevent such a large deficit, but feel that this advance should be made under the zone system and applied only to the zones exceeding a distance of 300 miles, which, at the existing rate of postage, fails to meet the cost of transportation paid by the Government.

In these various calculations it should be observed that the maximum price paid by the Government to the railroads for the largest mail cars is used as the basis.

The first estimates of cost, as will be observed, are based on the minimum weight of 12,000 pounds to the car of mail carried in 60-foot cars. These large cars usually have a carrying capacity of 40,000 pounds each. In fact, over that, and on many trains should carry a greater tonnage, especially when the character of the mail is of a weighty character. The figures of cost, as given therefore, represent fairness to the Government.

These figures represent, in like manner, the same degree of fairness in adding to the cost of a return of 40 per cent of the cars as empties for which the Government pays the railroads, even though they may contain no mail, despite the fact that on many of the railroads, especially those running north and south, the weight of mail carried is about the same in both directions. Right here it is made apparent that the great percentage of return of empty cars is due to the large shipments of magazines and other like publications westward on certain days of each week or month, requiring many large cars, 40 per cent of which are returned entirely empty at an absolute total loss to the Government, because there is no mail matter going eastward to load them.

This is not the case, however, with the newspapers of the country generally. The latter, to be found in all of the cities at terminal points of the railroads, at no time require or demand extra cars or extra service. Their circulation is daily and goes in all directions, and it is these newspaper publishers, mainly in the interior and smaller cities of the country, constituting at least 90 per cent of the daily newspaper publications of the United States, who are not putting any burden upon the Post Office Department, but who will be hurt most by the proposed legislation—looking to a flat increase of the postal rate, and yet they are those who are least able to bear the advance.

COST OF ZONES BEYOND 300 MILES

We have thus shown the injustice to the large body of daily newspaper publishers of the country that a flat increase of the postal rates within the 300-mile zone would entail, and therefore deem it not out of place to give figures, using the same basis as those employed in fixing the cost for the 300-mile zone, indicating what the cost in the zones beyond 300 miles would be, as follows, to wit:

Fourth zone, 600 miles, \$1.51 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.

Fifth zone, 1,000 miles, \$2.49 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.

Sixth zone, 1,400 miles, \$3.47 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.

Seventh zone, 1,800 miles, \$4.45 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.
 Eighth zone, 2,200 miles, \$5.43 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.
 Ninth zone, 2,600 miles, \$6.41 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.
 Tenth zone, 3,000 miles, \$7.39 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds.

It will be observed that we have added three zones to the zones established for the parcel post which are intended to cover distances beyond 1,800 miles, and by the adding of which the distance of about 3,300 miles, New York to San Francisco, is covered; except as to 300 miles, which is eliminated because of the barren territory through the Rocky Mountain section of the country, which mileage, however, in all fairness should not have been eliminated since it costs the Government just as much per mile to carry the cars over this 300-mile area as it costs to carry them through the thickly populated sections.

FIGURES STARTLING

These figures even up to and including the seventh zone of 1,800 miles are startling. They show to what extent magazines and other second-class publications (newspapers excepted) send such enormous amount of matter, frequently almost by the trainload, that are costing the department such large sums annually. No wonder that the department is annually compelled to face such a large deficit, and yet the bill now pending in the Senate under discussion, as at present framed, does not appear to have in view any method whereby the beneficiaries of these exorbitant discriminations in their favor will be asked to bear a fair share of the burden put upon the department by them, and which has resulted in such a large deficit, so palpably unjust to the department.

All of the figures in each and all of the zones, beginning with the first to the end, were made on the basis of the cost paid to the railroads for transportation of second-class matter, including newspapers and magazines, and show to what a marked degree the relations and obligations of the newspapers in this connection have been so grievously misunderstood. Nor has the enormous extent to which the publishers of magazines and other periodicals have been favored at the expense of the Government been hitherto made so clearly apparent.

MAGAZINES FAIL BY MILLIONS TO PAY COST OF TRANSPORTATION

Is it any wonder that some of these publishers have failed by several millions of dollars each year to pay the Government for the service rendered them? Is it any wonder that many of these publishers have added millions to their wealth from year to year? Is it at all surprising that several of these wealthy publishers failed to appear and present statements of their gross or net earnings to the Senate committee at the hearing on May 11 and 12; and is it not remarkable that any of those present should have had the temerity to urge a continuance of their pet "flat-rate basis" of postal rates, which in the past has worked such discriminations in their favor and filled their coffers each year to overflowing at the expense of the Government?

We are fully persuaded and verily believe that the figures herein given will prove a distinct revelation, if not to all, at least to a large proportion of the Members of both Houses of Congress and to the country at large if the facts should be given to the public.

We repeat that all figures contained in this statement and for each and every zone were worked out on the basis of the figures furnished by the Hon. Mr. Corridon for the 300-mile zone showing the actual cost paid by the Post Office Department to the railroads for the transportation of second-class matter. These, through error in calculation, may vary a fraction or so, but they are otherwise correct.

AMPLE SURPLUS TO MEET OVERHEAD EXPENSE

It may and doubtless will be asked if the second-class rate of newspapers within a zone of 300 miles does not include overhead charges, such as salaries to carriers, clerks, post-office officials, and the general expense of the department, how is this charge to be met? We answer there is ample margin between 48 cents per 100 pounds paid by the department to the railroads in the 300-mile zone and the \$1 per 100 pounds paid by the newspapers to meet any fair proportion of the legitimate expenses that may be chargeable for the service rendered by the Government to the daily newspapers.

COST OF HANDLING NEWSPAPERS LIMITED

The extent of the service rendered by the department to the newspapers is very meager, as compared with the service performed in handling other mail matter. The newspaper publishers do not ask the postmaster to call at their places of publication for the papers. The publishers perform that duty. They bind the papers in appropriate bundles and haul them not only to the post office but in many cases to the railway station, where after being weighed the bags and bundles are taken to the postal car already on the train and put in the car. The service performed by the employees of the post office is to weigh the papers, which, as a rule, can be done in a few minutes for each train by one man; the only other service being that performed by the mail agent in charge of the car, whose duty it is to take care of the bundles and bags of mail until they reach their destination and then throw them off on the platform for an agent of the newspaper to receive them and make delivery to the subscribers. This

system adds little or nothing to the expense of the department, since the man who weighs the bundles at the station also looks after the delivery of other mail from the post office to go out on the same trains, and the mail agent who handles the papers on the train and throws them off at destination would receive the same rate of wages that he now receives whether he handled these papers or not; nor would there be any diminution of the amount paid to the railroads for hauling newspapers if they hauled none, since the railroads are paid so much per mile for hauling the cars, whether loaded to their capacity or empty. Therefore, the larger number of papers the department can induce the publishers to send by mail the greater the net revenue to the department. If half of the capacity of each car were filled with newspapers, it would serve to add that much to the net receipts of the department; whereas if no newspapers were hauled, it would not diminish the expense of the department to the extent of a farthing, but only serve to decrease its receipts.

NEWSPAPERS ON RURAL ROUTES

The same is also true of newspapers delivered on rural routes. These papers are also carried either to the station or the post office by the publishers. The papers are put in bundles. All of the bundles are marked to show to what route each is destined.

Take, for illustration, Columbia, Tenn., about 40 miles from Nashville, from which a number of rural routes diverge. The bundles for each route are made up by the publisher and marked. They are then put into bags, tagged Columbia Rural Routes Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. When these bags reach Columbia the only handling by the postmaster is to have them carried from the station to the post office. The rural-route carriers know from the tags which bag contains their bundle. They take their respective bundles out of the bag and deliver the papers to each rural-route subscriber as they do other mail matter.

The rural carriers are paid a monthly wage. Whether they each carry 10 newspapers or 100 makes no difference in the cost to the department. The expense remains the same. The only question is, Shall the publishers of newspapers be permitted to continue to solicit subscriptions on rural routes, or shall they be forced to put up their subscription price, and thus largely curtail their number of subscribers?

Suppose a newspaper in Tennessee which is now paying the Government \$40,000 per annum for the carriage of such newspapers as it desires to have transported by mail should advance its subscription price so as to cut off half of its circulation by mail. Would that help the Government? Would it in any sense enable the Government to decrease its expenses? Would it not, on the other hand, simply cause the Government a loss of net revenue to the extent of \$20,000 per annum from this one newspaper?

ESTABLISHMENT OF RURAL ROUTES

The establishment of rural routes has been a great boon to the body of the people engaged in agricultural pursuits, and all well-managed newspapers have sought to render material aid in the endeavor to make the rural route system a success. Prior to the establishment of these routes, the farmer had to depend on his local weekly paper for his news, with an occasional stale weekly put out by some of the daily newspapers—the news in each case being not only meager but otherwise of little value. Scarcely any attention was being given then by the newspapers to the publication of market reports, which was, and would have been, of the greatest importance to the farmer.

It was then and had for years prior been the practice of the cattle, hog, sheep, horse, and mule buyer to travel through the country, and, in the absence of news to the farmer as to the daily fluctuation of the market, pick up such stock, often almost at his own price. The same was true of the buyer of grain, vegetables and other farm products, and especially true of the huckster, who dealt in eggs, butter, chickens, etc.

HELP OF NEWSPAPERS

These conditions have been changed, and mainly through the foresight of the publishers of well-conducted newspapers, who not only sought rural subscriptions, but made it a point to use one or more of the best men on their staff to give full and correct daily reports of the markets, not only of the city where the papers were published, but by daily telegraphic reports from Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities, indicating prices of farm products and the trend of the market.

It is our firm belief that in this respect the establishment of rural routes has materially benefited the farmer, and all well-conducted daily newspapers throughout the country have rendered substantial aid in this great work.

In addition, progressive daily newspapers have devoted at least a full page one day each week, known as the Farmer's Page, edited by competent writers, to enlighten the farmer in the best methods of cultivation.

Does Congress desire to encourage or cripple this work? It can encourage it by being fair to the daily newspaper. It can cripple it by adding to the burden of the publishers.

It may be claimed that 50 cents per annum added by Congress to an increase of the postal rates will not be much of an addition to the

subscription price of the paper. It will, however, be that much. It is not so much the amount as the seeming indifference to the interest of the farmer that will hurt.

INCREASE IN COST OF PRINT PAPER

It is well known that there has been an enormous increase in the cost of white paper. All well-conducted newspapers endeavor to secure a net subscription price equal to the cost of white print paper and postage. They do not, as a rule, seek more than that, they aim to meet all of the other enormous expenses which, too, have been largely increased, out of the receipts from advertising. A great many of the daily newspapers have already increased their subscription prices somewhat, but by no means sufficient to meet the increased expenses yet to follow. Many others have not made any increase, hoping rather that something would develop to obviate the necessity for any great increase in price. By the refusal of the print-paper trust to carry out its agreement with the Federal Trade Commission, it is made clear that still greater advances in the price of white paper is certain to take place. The contracts of newspapers for white paper, as a rule, expire either on the 1st of January or July of each year. Some expired on the 1st of July, 1917, many more will expire on the 1st of January, 1918. Surely Congress does not want to help add to the burden of newspapers by increasing the postal rate in a zone of 300 miles, when the rate of 1 cent per pound as shown is amply sufficient to meet the expense incurred by the department.

M'KELLAR AMENDMENT A SOLUTION

The adoption of Senator McKellar's amendment to H. R. 4280 referred to the Senate Finance Committee on the 22d of June, is, in our judgment, on proper lines. It may be deemed wise to make some changes in the rate on zones four to eight, inclusive, and it may even be considered advisable to eliminate one or more of the last zones, or add other zones. Certain it is that the zone system is the one and only one equitable method for the fixing of postal rates, and the one that will produce the greatest amount of revenue to the department, and cover such publications as those so greatly favored in the past by causing them to pay their rightful portions toward enabling the department to meet at least a portion of its annual deficit.

WILL BRING INCREASED REVENUE

The Senate committee's action in favor of the flat advance of one-quarter of a cent per pound will, it is estimated, add to the receipts of the department approximately \$3,000,000 per annum, while the war-profit tax of 5 per cent on newspapers and magazines will bring in \$7,500,000 additional per annum.

The honorable Assistant Postmaster General has given an estimate indicating that the provision of Senator McKellar's amendment will add approximately \$12,616,470 to the receipts of last year, thus giving the Government, through the Post Office Department, an excess in receipts of \$616,471 over the combined increase that will be derived under the Senate committee's proposal in favor of a flat advance in postal rates and the war-profit tax of 5 per cent combined.

And yet, through the adoption of Senator McKellar's amendment, the Government will not only establish a system of postal rates that will furnish the greater amount of additional revenue, but will fix the rate upon the one and only equitable basis that can be or has been devised. It will cause those who derive the greatest benefit to pay their equitable portion of the cost of the service rendered, and relieve those who are clearly bearing their full share of the burden, from any increase in rates, except in zones where such advance is or should be made to meet the costs of the service rendered on their behalf.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association, composed of more than five hundred publishers of daily newspapers in the United States, at its annual session in New York in April last, apprehended that an advance in letter postage would call for an advance of the rate on second-class matter, and after proper consideration of the subject, declared by unanimous vote in favor of the zone system, and appointed a legislative committee with instructions to govern itself accordingly in their presentation of the matter to Congress.

It appears that this committee, composed of capable men, did not follow the instructions given by the association as expressed in the unanimous action of the large annual meeting of its membership, but was persuaded that the publishers of newspapers should cooperate with the publishers of magazines, trade papers, and other periodicals in an endeavor to defeat an advance or change of any kind in the postal rates. To the extent that this committee acted in this manner in conjunction with the publishers of magazines, trade papers, etc., it did not represent the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

FAVORED ZONE AND FAIRNESS TO GOVERNMENT

The great body of American newspaper publishers in the expression of their wishes respecting postal rates wanted to be entirely fair to the Government. They wanted to do what fairness and equity demands of them as good citizens, and if, as they believed, an ad-

vance in rates on second-class matter should be found necessary, they were ready to support the advance, but they urged that the advance be made under the zone system and in a form and on a basis that would, in an equitable way, meet the situation.

They believed, as we have in this paper already shown, that the postage of 1 cent per pound now being paid would be sufficient to meet the cost of the Government of carrying newspapers within a 300-mile zone. They believed that the deficit in the Post Office Department was due largely to inadequate rates of postage on second-class matter carried for distances embraced in the fourth to the eighth zones, and that the rate covering these zones should be advanced to meet the cost incurred by the Government in rendering the service.

Members of the committee who appeared at the Senate Committee hearing, as the representatives of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, had been directed by a unanimous vote of that association to advocate the adoption of the zone system.

The association realized that something should be done to get rid of at least a portion of the large annual deficit of the Post Office Department, and that this result could not be reached in an equitable way by an advance in the existing flat rate. The association never for a moment thought that its committee would signify its approval of a continuance of the flat rate plan, or an inadequate and improper advance of rates under it.

The association knew that the flat rate plan had utterly failed to meet the expenses of the department incurred in the transportation of second-class mail matter, and also knew that a large proportion of the deficit of the Post Office Department was due to the use of that plan. The association also knew that a large portion of the deficit was attributable mainly to the immense volume of magazines, periodicals, and trade papers, carried for long distances at the "flat rate" far below the actual cost of transportation.

The association knew that a plan under which the Government was receiving only \$1 for 100 pounds, for carrying second-class matter two and three thousand miles, and for the transportation of which the Government was paying the railroads from five to seven dollars per hundred pounds, was utterly unsuited to meet the existing situation. The association, therefore, favored its abandonment, and the adoption of a plan or system whereby a reasonable and equitable adjustment could be made and the department relieved of at least a portion of its annual deficit.

DIDN'T SUPPOSE COMMITTEE WOULD DISREGARD INSTRUCTIONS

Never for a moment did any portion of the large membership of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association assume that its committee would enter into any arrangement or understanding with the publishers of magazines, periodicals, and trade papers, whereby the association should be made to stand before Congress and the people of the United States in favor of the continuance of a system that was annually causing a deficit of fifty million or more to the department.

It never occurred to the newspaper publishers, that members of its committee would even by silence acquiesce in a demand or suggestion from the publishers of magazines, periodicals, and trade papers, for a continuance of the ruinous "flat rate" plan.

The association felt that an advance would have to come to meet the large deficiency and that it should and could only be met in an equitable way through the adoption of the zone plan, and the establishment of rates under it in keeping with the cost of transportation paid by the Government.

The Newspaper Publishers' committee fully understood this and yet yielded to the importunities of magazine, trade paper, and periodical publishers. This committee by its silence permitted the Senate Committee to assume that the American Newspaper Publishers' Association was willing to assent to the continuance of a system which it, by its previous action, had unanimously condemned.

Members of the Newspaper Publishers' committee realizing that they had not represented the expressed wish of the association, frankly admitted the fact and advised other members of the association who were in Washington at the time to proceed with their desire to secure the adoption of the zone system, in favor of which the American Newspaper Publishers' Association had so emphatically declared.

This is in part why the undersigned are seeking to accomplish that result.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS UNDERSTAND SITUATION

Intelligent publishers of newspapers all know that the Post Office Department is confronted with a large annual deficit.

They know to what this deficit is mainly attributable.

They realize that something should be done to meet the situation. They believe the zone plan will.

They are ready to do their part under it.

The undersigned, therefore, are urging the adoption of the zone as the only feasible and equitable plan yet conceived to produce the desired result.

We realize that the Government has no right to subsidize either the publishers of newspapers or of magazines, periodicals, and trade papers. We feel that the Government has no right to render a service to either at an annual loss of millions of dollars.

The Government, through an act of Congress, and the wise administration of the act by the Post Office Department, has succeeded in securing contracts for the transportation of mails at a reasonable price. All that Congress should do, and all that the publishers of newspapers are asking it to do, is to give them a basis of rates on second-class mail matter in keeping with the cost the Government may incur in the transportation of newspapers under these contracts.

The newspapers will be content with rates made on that basis, and the publishers of magazines, trade papers, and periodicals, who have for years been the beneficiaries of the present unjust and indefensible "flat rate" system and have at the expense of the Government grown enormously rich under it, assuredly have no right to ask for anything else.

SOUTHERN NEWSPAPERS FAVOR ZONE PLAN

It is in this connection quite proper to suggest that the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association, composed of 105 of the leading daily newspapers of the South and many of whom are also members of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, at its annual convention held at Asheville, N. C., July 10, 1917, also by unanimous vote adopted a strong resolution urging the enactment of the zone system, and appointed three of the undersigned as members of a committee to present the views of the association to Congress.

The Asheville convention also in the same resolution unanimously declared that the proposed profit or war tax of 5 per cent on the net revenue of newspapers was in the nature of a penalty, that it was unfair and discriminatory, and insisted in lieu that newspapers should be taxed in the same manner as taxes were levied on other lines of business.

It is therefore the duty and privilege of members of this committee to convey to the Senate and House of Representatives the unanimously expressed view of this association in favor of the zone system as contemplated under the McKellar amendment and the rejection of the 5 per cent profit or war-tax provision contained in the pending bill.

NEWSPAPERS NOT ABSOLVED FROM INCREASE RATE

The adoption of the zone system by no means absolves the daily newspapers from increase in the postal rates. There are many, in fact, a large majority of the daily newspapers who have a circulation far beyond the third zone; in fact, even beyond the eighth and last zone, who would cheerfully pay any advance of the rates in these zones, because they believe it their duty to bear their equitable share in support of the Government.

Take, for example, the case of the Nashville Banner. It has no inconsiderable circulation beyond the 300-mile zone. The States of Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, California, Arizona, and New Mexico have within their borders a large number of Tennesseans, who have a longing for their old home and want, at least, to know what is going on in their State. This newspaper, located at the capital city of Tennessee, not unmindful of this sentiment, inaugurated many years ago a plan of having a reliable correspondent in practically every county seat in the State of Tennessee. It is the duty of these correspondents to keep the Banner advised of all current happenings in their county and neighborhoods worthy of being printed. Other Tennessee newspapers have followed in the wake of the Banner, but not perhaps to the same extent, and consequently the Banner may be regarded as the favorite newspaper of Tennesseans who have gone into other States to establish their homes. The desire to hear from home is felt, also, of course, by the large number of Tennesseans who spend their winters in Florida and California and at the Gulf ports, and also those who go to Colorado for their health, as well as others who go to the eastern seashore resorts, to the lakes of Wisconsin and Michigan, and other places during the summer months.

MUST PAY THEIR SHARE UNDER INCREASED ZONE RATE

The Banner, along with other newspapers, has a considerable circulation which goes to its foreign advertisers located in the West, East, and the North, far beyond the 300-mile zone. These advertisers are entitled to the Banner. They want and have a right to see that their advertisements appear in proper form and at the proper time. The Banner also exchanges with many of the leading newspapers of the country, so that these several matters give the paper a circulation of considerable proportion, upon which it must pay the increase rate fixed beyond the 300-mile zone, and what is here said of the Banner in this respect applies to practically all other daily newspapers of the country, although perhaps not in all cases to the same extent.

Mention of this is made to show that the daily newspapers, in advocating the zone system with the 300-mile limit left at 1 cent per pound, are not actuated alone by selfish aims, but by a desire to secure justice, and a readiness to accept a plan by which the publishers of daily newspapers, as well as the publishers of magazines, trade papers, and peri-

odicals, may all be made to bear their rightful share of the expenses incurred by the department for their benefit.

The zone system is not new. It is now and has been for a half century in use by the railroads in the establishment of fares on passenger trains, the railroads fixing their rates of passenger fares, in the main, on the basis of the distance passengers wish to travel.

The Government, in the establishment of the Parcel Post System, very wisely established the zone system, and through it has accomplished splendid results for the masses engaged in agriculture, as well as the merchants and those with whom they transact business through the parcel post as their medium, and it does seem that what is equitable and fair to the farmer and the merchant should be good enough for the newspapers, the magazines, and the general public.

RATES IN CANADA AND BY EXPRESS

Reverting to the matter of allowing the 1 cent per pound rate for a zone of 300 miles to stand, it will not be amiss to state that the Government of Canada has established for daily newspapers a postal rate not exceeding 50 cents per 100 pounds on any distance within the Dominion, with a rate of 25 cents per 100 pounds for distances under 50 miles.

Also, that all of the express companies in the United States, on December 15, 1915, established and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission tariffs providing that "when no wagon service is rendered, either in receipt or delivery, and special mail or newspaper trains are not used, the rate shall be one-half cent per pound for each company carrying."

This fits the case of the newspapers, and would in nearly all sections of the country permit newspapers to be shipped by express for 1,000 or more miles at a rate of 50 cents per 100 pounds, and the only reason why this rate has not been made available to a greater extent by the newspapers is that it does not make the rural-route service as available or desirable as the regular service by mail, and also because, generally speaking, the newspapers prefer as far as practicable to give their patronage to the Government. If driven to it by the action of Congress, many papers will be forced to a much greater extent to give their patronage to the express companies.

We desire in this connection to correct the impression that newspapers are favored by being allowed free of postage access by mail to the rural routes in the counties where the papers are published. The law does not apply to daily newspapers, but alone to weekly papers published in the county. The daily papers pay full second-class postal rates on all papers they send by mail to rural routes and to all other subscribers located in the counties where the daily papers are being published.

NEWSPAPERS AND THE WAR

An effort has been made, even in congressional debate, to make it appear that the newspapers of the country are largely responsible for this country's entrance into the war, and that they should be heavily taxed to help meet the expenses incident to the war. It has been even charged that a considerable number of the larger newspapers of the country were subsidized to induce them to create a sentiment in favor of war. We know nothing as to the truth of these allegations. It may be that munition manufacturers, Wall Street, or Lombard Street have used money for that purpose, or it may be, as has been suggested, that a distinguished British lord who owns a number of leading daily newspapers in England and other portions of Europe has gotten a grip on one or more of the leading newspapers of this country. We certainly hope for the honor of American journalism that these allegations have no foundation.

We know that a large majority of the American newspapers favored war, and we must assume that they were honest in their declaration. The newspapers of the country were not all, however, for war. Many of them, controlled by able and loyal American citizens, deplored war and hoped it might be averted. They, at least, said nothing in favor of war, but when the Congress of the United States declared that war existed these men burned their bridges behind them, declaring it to be their purpose to support Congress and the administration in all things designed to bring the war to a successful conclusion.

ALL PAPERS SUPPORTING GOVERNMENT

All of the newspapers of this country—the latter class as well as the former—have since that declaration by Congress loyally and energetically supported the President and Congress in all matters designed to bring the war to a speedy and successful end. They have labored earnestly and anxiously to this end. Nothing has been left unwritten or undone to rally the masses to the support of the Government.

Take the daily issues of practically every newspaper published in the United States and it will be found that fully 80 per cent of the reading space has been devoted to news relating to the war and at least 70 per cent of the 80 per cent has been devoted to the promotion of every plan suggested by the authorities in Washington to aid in its successful prosecution.

Take every phase of the question, beginning with the necessary legislation by Congress, and the newspapers have been found loyal and active in aid of the Government.

The movement to secure volunteers for the Navy and Regular Army, the registration of eligibles for enlistment in the Army under the select draft act, subscriptions to the Liberty loan bonds, contributions to the American Red Cross, in fact, any and all matters that would be helpful to the Government in this crisis have had the active support of the newspapers of the country.

LOYAL WITHOUT MONEY AND WITHOUT PRICE

England, it is said, spent something over \$50,000,000 in advertising its loans and in its appeals for recruits to its army. The Dominion of Canada is said to have devoted \$15,000,000 to a like purpose, but no man can point in any direction to show that the newspapers of this country have been paid a farthing by the Government for the great work they have done, nor asked the Government to pay anything for that work.

On the other hand, the columns of the newspapers of this country have been filled to overflowing in earnest and anxious endeavors to promote the interests of this country in the prosecution of the war, and for which they have neither asked nor received a farthing of compensation in any form.

It is inconceivable in the light of the public record made by the newspapers of this country that the Congress of the United States should wish for any reason to inflict a penalty or burden upon them. There could certainly be no better evidence given of the patriotic endeavor of the newspapers to give active support to the Government and aid as far as possible in having the war brought to a speedy and successful conclusion than what they have done up to the present time.

NO DESIRE TO ATTACK MAGAZINES

It is not our wish in dealing with this matter to attack the publishers of magazines, trade papers, and periodicals, who are doing a good work in their lines. An advocacy of the zone plan does not mean an attack on such publishers. It simply means that the zone system is the best and only equitable basis to govern in fixing rates on second-class matter.

This zone system applies to daily newspapers as well as to magazines and trade papers. It fixes the same rate for both. The only reason why the magazines will pay more under this system is because they are not paying their proportion under the flat-rate plan. The newspapers and magazines under the zone system will pay precisely the same rate, the only difference being that the transportation of magazines over such longer distances and in such larger quantities will require those publishers to pay a larger sum to the Government to meet the cost of transporting the large volume of their publications carried over the longer distances.

The present flat-rate plan, which the publishers of magazines insist upon having continued, is so patently unjust to the Government that it seems incredible these gentlemen should have the temerity to insist upon its continuance.

ILLUSTRATIONS BY COMPARISON

Take a zone of 300 miles, for example, within which the daily newspapers have their principal circulation, and the average rate paid to the railroads within that zone costs the Government 48 cents per hundred pounds. The rate of 1 cent per pound now paid by the newspapers gives the Government \$1 per hundred pounds, leaving a surplus of profit of 52 cents per hundred pounds to the Government.

Take zone 7, for example, of 1,800 miles, in which the magazines, trade papers, and periodicals circulate largely, and the average transportation within that zone costs the Government \$4.459 per hundred pounds. The flat rate of 1 cent per pound now paid by the magazines, trade papers, and other periodicals gives the Government only \$1 per hundred pounds, creating a loss of \$3.459 per hundred pounds to the Government.

Is there any fairness or even common honesty back of a proposition like this? Why should the Congress of the United States wish to continue a plan that will cause a loss to the Government of fifty or more million dollars annually?

STARTLING EXAMPLES

A more startling example will be found in the following illustration: The distance from Nashville to Columbia, Tenn., is approximately 40 miles. The United States Government charges the Nashville newspapers \$1 per hundred pounds to carry the papers from Nashville to Columbia. The cost of transportation paid by the Government to the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. is 17½ cents per hundred pounds, leaving the Government a surplus or profit of 82½ cents per hundred pounds with which to meet overhead charges, etc.

The distance from New York to San Francisco is 3,300 miles. The United States Government charges the publishers of magazines, etc., under the flat-rate plan only \$1 per hundred pounds for carrying their publications from New York, Philadelphia, or Boston to San Francisco.

It costs the Government approximately \$7.309 per hundred pounds to carry these publications to California, thus creating a net loss to the Government of \$6.309 per hundred pounds.

Is it any wonder, in the light of these facts, that the Post Office Department is having a deficit of fifty or more million dollars annually? What is to be said of a plan or system that demands \$1 per hundred pounds for carrying newspapers a distance of 40 miles and at the same time permits magazine publishers to carry their publications for a distance of 3,300 miles at the same price?

There is really only one equitable manner of adjustment in dealing with this question, and that is the application of the zone system on the lines indicated in Senator McKellar's amendment, and the present Congress should, now that the question is up for consideration, promptly adjust the matter in that way.

SPECIAL 5 PER CENT WAR TAX UNJUST AND DISCRIMINATORY

Section 1106 of the bill pending in the Senate provides:

"That in addition to the taxes under existing law and under this act there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid, for the calendar year 1917 and each calendar year thereafter, upon the net income of every individual, corporation, partnership, or association arising from the publication of newspapers, magazines, or periodicals, entitled to be entered as second-class mail matter (whether or not so entered), a tax of 5 per cent of the amount of such net income in excess of \$4,000."

The effort to levy a special tax on the publishers of newspapers is apparently based on the assumption that the publishers who have availed themselves of the second-class postal rate are receiving large benefits therefrom at the expense of the Government and should therefore have levied upon them an extraordinary or special tax not placed upon other lines of industry or business.

Speaking for the publishers of daily newspapers we earnestly protest against this view, not only because the proposed tax is discriminatory and unfair but because the apparent reason assigned for its application to the daily newspapers is without warrant or justification.

While it is true that the daily newspapers of the country have been entered as "mail matter of the second class" and have paid postage on that basis, it is entirely erroneous to assume that the great body of the daily newspapers of the country (a half dozen of the large metropolitan dailies alone excepted) have had any gratuities or benefits conferred upon them by the Government, through which a loss of revenue has been inflicted on the Post Office Department. On the contrary, as indicated on many pages of this address, newspapers have paid to the department not only what is equal to the cost of transportation but sufficient in excess of that cost to help the department meet an equitable portion of the overhead expenses incurred on their account.

We therefore urge that section 1106 of the bill be stricken out or so amended as to exempt publishers of daily newspapers from its operation.

RESULT THAT WILL FOLLOW ADOPTION OF COURSE SUGGESTED

The adoption of this course, along with the adoption of the zone system under the McKellar amendment, will leave the newspapers of the country:

First. To continue the payment of the present rate of postage within the 300-mile zone.

Second. To pay such advance in the postal rate as may be by the adoption of the zone system beyond the 300-mile limit be established.

Third. To continue to pay the income tax hitherto paid by the newspapers under existing law.

Fourth. To pay a profit or war income tax on the basis that such tax shall be made applicable to all other lines of business.

This we submit as fair and equitable and will in that way, without discrimination, cause the newspapers of the country to furnish their just proportion of the money needed not only to aid in the prosecution of the war but to help meet other current expenditures of the Government.

Respectfully submitted.

E. B. STAHLMAN.
LOUIS J. WORTHAM.
ROBERT EWING.
UREY WOODSON.
LAFAYETTE YOUNG.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 15, 1917.

MR. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the question of economy always intrudes itself into the discussion of a question of this kind. We had that question injected into the subject of giving compensation to the veterans who served the Government in the World War. I voted to override the veto of that measure by the President because I believed the President was ill-advised when he believed that the taxpayers of the country should be saved the money at the expense of those who risked their lives in the service of the Government during the war. I believe the President is ill-advised now when he expects to keep the expenses of the Government down at the expense of

the pockets and the stomachs of the men who work in the Postal Service, and at the expense of those men's wives and children. Any organization conducting a business which depends on keeping its treasury filled or which depends for dividends for its stockholders upon funds taken out of the pockets of the underpaid employees is not collecting its dividends or taking its expenses from the proper source.

We are taxing the American people several hundred million dollars a year to pay the interest on the money that foreign governments owe us. That money saved to the taxpayers of America would reduce taxes a great deal. I cite that fact because I believe there are so many other ways in which we can save the taxpayers' money without taking it out of the pockets of the families of those who work in the Postal Service. Only a short time ago we sank a new but unfinished battleship that cost the taxpayers \$35,000,000, and a few days later we passed an appropriation bill carrying something over \$100,000,000 to build some new warships.

Something like a month ago the chief financial advisor of the administration issued something like \$200,000,000 in bonds. Those bonds are tax-exempt when held by corporations. He paid an interest rate so high that the issue of \$200,000,000 of bonds was oversubscribed something like \$1,000,000,000. I think it is fair to charge that the Government is paying at least one-half to 1 per cent too much interest upon that issue. Under its terms all outstanding issues of bonds can be converted by holders thereof for the new issue, and if they take advantage of that provision something like \$4,600,000,000 of outstanding securities can be converted for the new issue. This is a higher rate of interest than is paid by the Government of Great Britain.

I am calling this to the attention of Senators to show another place where the Government can save the taxpayers money without taking it out of those who labor every day in all kinds of weather to serve the people of America. I am not saying this in any partisan sense. An economic problem that has to do with the welfare of the Treasury should not be a partisan issue.

I have in my hand an editorial from the Pioneer Press of St. Paul, a 100-per cent Republican newspaper, which shows that even the editor of that paper takes exception to the high rate of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury pays to the investors who buy these securities, and which exorbitant or unnecessary rate charge is paid for by the taxpayers of America. I send the editorial to the desk and ask that the Clerk may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Without objection, the Clerk will read as requested.

The principal legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Wednesday, December 10, 1924]

MR. MELLON'S SILENCE

On Monday the Pioneer Press printed an interview with Prof. Roy G. Blakey, of the University of Minnesota, in which he seriously called into question certain aspects of the United States Treasury's new offering of 4 per cent, 20 to 30 year bonds. Simultaneously it brought the attention of Secretary Mellon to Professor Blakey's views. The Pioneer Press has been informed that Mr. Mellon has no comment to make.

Professor Blakey's main contention is that this issue should have been offered either at a lower rate of interest or for a shorter number of years, preferably the latter.

The importance of this question does not lie on the surface. On its face the issue amounts to \$200,000,000 "or thereabout," and will be used to take up part of the \$200,000,000 certificates of indebtedness falling due on December 15, which can not be met out of tax revenues. But in addition the Secretary of the Treasury may refund, according to these same terms, all third Liberty loan 4½ per cent bonds, Treasury notes of the series A-1925, and certificates of indebtedness of the series TM-1925. If this policy is followed by the Treasury, as it apparently proposes to do, and if full advantage of this opportunity is taken by the holders of these obligations, the issue in fact can amount to \$4,200,000,000, or possibly to \$4,600,000,000.

The Treasury then will be paying at a rate of 4 per cent for a minimum of 20 years on a sum upward to four billions. It is a matter of great interest to the public therefore, if the terms of this issue are, as Professor Blakey contends, unfavorable to the Government.

So far as the Pioneer Press can discover there is no difference of opinion among responsible business authorities on the fact that this issue could have been successfully placed on the market on more favorable terms to the Government—either for a shorter term, so that it would be possible for the Government to take advantage of lower interest rates later, or at a lower rate. There is even some opinion that the Government might have had both without endangering the success of the issue.

This belief may be ill founded, and Secretary Mellon's judgment of the market may be quite accurate. We are not just now raising that point. But whether the terms of this issue are or are not justifiable is a matter of real public concern, and when a responsible and competent authority such as Professor Blakey calls them into question the public should be able to expect something more from the Treasury than a dismissal of the criticism with the explanation that it has no comment to make.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I will simply say in conclusion that I believe the self-respect of the American people demands that we see to it that the postal employees are paid a decent living wage.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] made some comments on the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterling], which was amended and reported to the Senate by the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which I am a member. That Senator made some very grievous errors in his statements. I do not attribute bad faith to the Senator; he is a man of high integrity and ability, but I think his excitement and his possible fear that the Senate is incapable of passing the bill in question with certain amendments caused him to make those statements.

The Senator from Tennessee stated that the bill had been reported out without consideration after having been in the committee for only two or three days. He is very much in error in that statement, because the subcommittee worked long hours all through the Christmas holidays on this bill. I know as one of the committee members that I worked every night until after midnight so long as I could keep awake. I know that the committee gave very earnest consideration to the testimony of a great many witnesses and to a vast amount of detail that came before it. I refer the printed hearings of our subcommittee to all Senators present and hope they will take the opportunity to study them very carefully. Should they do so they will see that able men came from all over the country representing every industry practically that had any interest in the question of postal rates, and that they testified at length before us.

We did not attempt to alter the provisions of the postal salary bill; that matter was threshed out at the last session; but we confined ourselves to the rate-increase question. I wish to call attention to an amendment proposing to reduce certain rates on second-class matter which I have presented to the bill for consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ODDIE. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask the Senator from Nevada a question before he enters upon a discussion of his amendment.

Mr. ODDIE. Very well; I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. HARRISON. Are the postal employees in the District of Columbia paid out of the general fund of the Treasury, or are they paid out of the postal revenue?

Mr. ODDIE. I will have to tell the Senator that I can not answer that question without looking into some reports. I am not familiar with that particular phase of the matter.

Mr. HARRISON. I propounded the question to the Senator because I thought that if there were any Senator who would know it would be the Senator from Nevada, because he happens to be a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I assume, however, that none of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, unless he should make a research, would know. [Laughter.]

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I have to admit that I am only human and that in the work of the subcommittee I have attempted to do something which is practically impossible for anybody living to do—to digest the reports that were given us by the Post Office Department and to study and understand the whole problem of the Post Office Department in a very short time. We know this problem only to a degree; those of us who have given considerable time to it have learned certain things concerning the Post Office Department; but I must confess that with certain conditions relating to the District post office I am not familiar. However, we have done the very best we could in the very short time that was allowed us.

Mr. President, I for one am anxious that the so-called Sterling bill shall pass after it shall have had a reasonable amount of discussion and certain necessary amendments, and I do not think it will take long. I know that the Members of the Senate on both sides of the Chamber have abundance of ability and courage and that heretofore they have never hesitated in attacking a difficult problem.

I feel, Mr. President, that the question of the salaries of the postal employees is too serious a one to be treated in a frivolous manner. I for one shall do all I can to help the Sterling bill through. As I have stated, I have proposed an amendment which, if adopted, will reduce the rates on the advertising portion of periodicals using the second-class mail in the first and second zones. That will relieve the publishers of what I think is an unjust burden. When we consider that the postage on second-class mail matter has been increased several times in the last few years and in the same period that fourth-class mail rates have been reduced twice, I feel that in justice to all the amendment I have proposed to this bill should be given most careful consideration and that it should pass.

I, for one, intend to support the President in his veto. I have read his veto message with great care, and, while some of my colleagues may not agree with me, I am not prepared to argue with them on that score, for I feel that it is a case where every man should search his own conscience and should use his own discretion and best judgment. I have no quarrel with anybody who disagrees with me on this problem; but in voting to support the veto I do so as one member of the committee which has presented a bill which can be made workable and practicable, and which can be passed, and which carries the increased postal salaries in exactly the same form in which the bill the President vetoed carried them.

I feel, Mr. President, that we should be serious about this matter; that we should not allow our fears and apprehensions to enter into the problem at all. When we consider that the postal employees, scores of thousands of them all over the country, are vitally interested and watching our actions, I feel it is the duty of every Senator here to handle this problem seriously and carefully and to do his utmost to secure the enactment of a bill which will carry the increase in salaries and which, at the same time, will raise more revenue and be fair and just to the users of the mails.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, it would be pleasant indeed if we could comply with the numerous requests for salary increases—among others, that of the postal employees. The demand for an increase is universal and the extra pay is desired for good purposes—to provide better homes and living conditions for employees and their families, to pay debts, or to give their children better opportunities.

Of course, we all know it would be good politics to vote for the bill. When a group is so intensely interested in a subject, it always becomes an important political matter. The larger group—the general public—is affected only indirectly. Therefore, they are not watching the question very closely nor will they long remember how the Senators voted thereon. A well-known English statesman once said:

You can tax the English people into bankruptcy without any serious protest on their part if you will only do it by indirect taxes.

The situation is quite similar in this country.

I failed to support this bill at the time it passed the Senate last May and I can not support it now. Therefore, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

It is admitted that the bill will add about \$65,000,000 to the cost of handling the mails—about \$3 per family. The bill provides for the expense but does not provide how the money shall be raised. Each class thinks it should be exempt from the extra burden and that it should be borne by some other class. But, first of all, we must consider fairly the question of equity toward the post-office employees. The main question is how do their salaries compare with those of others in similar lines of employment?

The Post Office Department has made a brief report dealing with comparative salaries, also furnished comparison of salaries paid in private employment. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be incorporated in the Record as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1924.

(Memorandum for the Postmaster General)

The act approved July 2, 1918, provided increased compensation of \$200 per annum to clerks and carriers in post offices and to railway postal clerks and approximately \$240 per annum to rural carriers. In addition there were increases in compensation to a large number of the supervisory force.

The act of November 8, 1919, further increased the compensation of postal employees from \$100 to \$200 per annum.

The act of June 5, 1920, generally known as the reclassification act, provided further increases in compensation ranging from \$200 to \$300

for clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks, and \$260 for rural carriers, and in addition there were substantial increases in salaries of the supervisory force, ranging from \$200 to \$600.

The effect of these increases in salary grades over those in effect during the fiscal year 1918 may be summarized as follows:

An increase of \$600 granted to clerks and carriers in post offices.

An increase of \$500 granted to railway postal clerks.

An increase of \$600 granted to rural carriers.

The following summary shows the additional expenditures on account of increased compensation over and above the expenditures under the salary scale that was in effect during the fiscal year 1918 as the result of the three acts of Congress above referred to for the fiscal years 1919 to 1924, both inclusive:

Fiscal year:	
1919	\$83,202,600
1920	68,901,000
1921	110,750,000
1922	118,221,000
1923	122,882,500
1924	129,884,576
Total	583,847,676

These amounts are cumulative; that is, the amount stated for the year 1920 also includes the amount which was additional for the year 1919.

SALARIES PAID IN THE SERVICE

The following is the range of salaries of officials and employees in the Postal Service:

Post-office clerks and carriers	\$1,400.00 to \$1,800
Special clerks	1,900.00 to 2,000
Average salary, post-office clerks, 1923	1,691.68
Average salary, post-office carriers, 1924	1,743.81
Railway postal clerks	1,000.00 to 2,300
Average salary of railway postal clerks, 1924	2,111.00
Average salary of railway postal clerks, including travel allowance	2,294.00
Clerks at division headquarters of the Railway Mail Service and post-office inspectors	1,600.00 to 2,300
Chief clerks in post-office inspectors' headquarters	2,600.00
Laborers in post offices and the Railway Mail Service	1,350.00 to 1,450
Superintendents of mails, post-office service	2,100.00 to 4,400
Assistant superintendent of mails, post-office service	2,200.00 to 3,800
Foremen, post-office service	2,100.00 to 2,300
Postal cashiers, post-office service	2,600.00 to 4,000
Money-order cashiers, post-office service	2,300.00 to 3,600
Assistant chief clerks, Railway Mail Service	2,500.00
Chief clerks, Railway Mail Service	3,000.00
Assistant division superintendents, Railway Mail Service	3,200.00
Division superintendents, Railway Mail Service	4,200.00
Post-office inspectors	2,300.00 to 3,700
Post-office inspectors in charge	4,200.00

AVERAGE SALARIES OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS, POST-OFFICE CARRIERS, AND RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS

Comparisons of the average salaries in the Postal Service with average salaries of like or similar employments in other governmental services and in business institutions must be made with the average salaries of clerks, carriers, and railway postal clerks. These salaries in the Postal Service are as follows:

Average salaries, fiscal year 1924, of—	
Post-office clerks	\$1,691.68
Post-office carriers	1,743.81
Railway postal clerks	2,111.00
Railway postal clerks, including travel allowance	2,294.00

AVERAGE SALARIES OF LIKE EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE IN WASHINGTON

A reliable estimate of the average of salaries for employees for grades 1 to 7, inclusive, in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in the District of Columbia places it at \$1,704 per annum, and for the same for grades from 1 to 6, inclusive, \$1,659 per annum.

SALARIES PAID IN BUSINESS INSTITUTIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

In May, 1924, the department secured through direct investigation by its special officers detailed to the work the range of salaries paid to persons employed by business institutions throughout the country. Investigations were made in the following cities whose populations range from 1,972 to 5,600,000:

New York, N. Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; Boston, Mass.; Kansas City, Mo.; New Haven, Conn.; Des Moines, Iowa; Scranton, Pa.; Utica, N. Y.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Montgomery, Ala.; Hagerstown, Md.; Jackson, Tenn.; Geneva, N. Y.; Guthrie, Okla.; Illon, N. Y.; Herkimer, N. Y.; Americus, Ga.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Salem, Ohio; Cadillac, Mich.; Webb City, Mo.; Seneca Falls, N. Y.; Bryan, Ohio; Danville, Ky.; Corinth, Miss.; Portland, Ind.; Ravenna, Ohio; Elkton, Md.; Newport, Pa.

The general average for the entire group of these offices for each class of employee below named was found to be as follows:

Bank clerks	\$1,382
Stock clerks	1,223
Shipping clerks	1,119

Railroad clerks	\$1,455
Stenographers	1,299
Bookkeepers	1,398
General office clerks	1,176
Cashiers	1,033
Typists	1,029
Freight handlers	1,273
Express handlers	1,857
Express clerks	1,492
Delivery drivers	1,877

It is not argued from comparisons with salaries paid employees in general business that it is not just to pay to postal employees a scale of wages somewhat higher. The conditions under which employment is undertaken in the Postal Service and those under which it is undertaken in general business are different. We expect to attract to the Postal Service those who will make it a life work. Consequently the scale of salaries should be high enough to insure permanent continuance in the service. This means a scale sufficiently high to enable the employee to take upon himself all the obligations of citizenship and his place in society. However, a careful comparison of rates of compensation paid to postal employees and those paid to others in like grades of commercial lines shows that generally the advantage rests with the postal employee.

LABOR TURNOVER IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The following statements show for clerks and carriers in the Postal Service the number of resignations:

CARRIERS			
Fiscal year	Number in service	Number of resignations	Percentage
1919	35,024	2,025	5.78
1920	36,142	2,528	6.99
1921	38,532	1,348	3.50
1922	39,485	637	1.61
1923	40,134	858	2.17
1924	43,820	921	2.10

CLERKS			
Fiscal year	Number in service	Number of resignations	Percentage
1919	44,681	4,961	11.10
1920	47,508	7,473	15.70
1921	53,703	5,161	9.61
1922	56,029	3,112	5.55
1923	57,183	3,365	5.88
1924	63,182	4,144	6.56

The following shows a comparative statement showing the resignations of clerks and carriers during the five months' period ended November 30, 1923, and 1924:

Month	Clerks resigned		Carriers resigned	
	1923	1924	1923	1924
July	266	284	79	60
August	402	196	86	62
September	400	329	90	62
October	260	421	88	91
November	800	232	91	64
Total	2,128	1,462	434	339

MAINTENANCE OF LISTS OF ELIGIBLES

POSTAL CLERKS AND CARRIERS

There does not appear to be any greater difficulty in maintaining lists of eligibles at this time than there was when this matter was before Congress last spring. In general there appears to be no difficulty in maintaining these lists to fill vacancies. There are certain localities, however, where difficulty does exist, these being large cities or industrial communities affected in the one case by high costs of living due to metropolitan conditions and in the other case by the higher wage scale and living costs prevailing in the industrial communities.

The latest reports from 76 offices of the country show a general condition of unemployed available time of substitute clerks and carriers. These are shown in the following table for the 76 largest offices as a whole:

	Number	Work equivalent to whole time	Surplus
Substitute clerks	6,334	4,343	2,010
Average per office	83	56	26
Substitute carriers	5,440	3,731	1,742
Average per office	71	49	23

RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS

There is no difficulty experienced in securing a sufficient number of eligibles to fill vacancies in the Railway Mail Service except in very few States, such as those having very small populations, as Nevada, Wyoming, and Arizona. There is no more trouble in filling vacancies in the Railway Mail Service than there was before the war.

There are approximately 10,000 eligibles on the list at the present time, and there were 27,000 applicants for examination held throughout the country by the Civil Service Commission on May 3, 1924.

STEWART.

WHO IS UNDERPAID

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, it is remarkable that while this bill has been before Congress for a year, no substantial proof has been submitted to show that post office employees are getting a lower salary than others engaged in similar lines of employment. If they are underpaid as compared to other laborers in similar lines, surely the increase should be granted. I have a fairly good acquaintance with conditions in my own State, and I know that as far as South Dakota is concerned, lower salaries are paid in the courthouses, in the banks, and in the mercantile establishments than are paid the post office employees.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NORBECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDGE. I think the Senator was not in the Chamber yesterday when I had the pleasure of addressing the Senate on that particular point. In view of the fact that a letter carrier receives approximately \$27 a week and a hod carrier receives \$36 a week, does not the Senator think that there is some distinction between employments throughout the country?

Mr. NORBECK. I recall very well the Senator's speech. He did not say that letter carriers receive \$27 a week; he said that some of them receive that amount in the beginning of their service.

Mr. EDGE. In their first year.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator did not speak of that as an average salary.

Mr. EDGE. No; that is the entrance salary.

Mr. NORBECK. And the Senator did not state on what authority he made the statement that hod carriers received \$6 a day. I have never heard of any such wages being paid to them.

Mr. EDGE. I made the statement on the authority of the Department of Labor of the United States Government.

Mr. NORBECK. Where and when were such wages paid?

Mr. EDGE. That is the average pay.

Mr. NORBECK. I am not sure of that; but possibly their case may be similar to the case of the plumbers. A prominent attorney's wife of this city said, after she had paid the plumber's bill, she wished she had married a plumber instead of a lawyer. [Laughter.] Of course, there are some lines of employment which are very well organized. The Senator might also make the comparison with the plasterers of Chicago, who a year or two ago were getting \$25 a day for performing approximately half the work they performed 10 years ago. I object to that kind of comparison. I think there should be a general survey and that all lines should be included instead of merely the plumbers and hod carriers and plasterers.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator having made that point in his address, if he will consult the Record of yesterday he will find that I inserted in the Record a report on, I think, 15 different industries.

Mr. NORBECK. But the Senator did not state on what authority the figures were given. He said he had them from a printed document of some kind which was before him.

Mr. EDGE. They were all taken from reports of the Department of Labor.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator did not so state yesterday.

Mr. EDGE. I will be glad to turn them over to the Senator if he desires to see them.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wonder if it will interrupt the Senator if I call attention to a statement the President makes on that point.

Mr. NORBECK. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIS. On page 3 of the veto message the following language appears:

At the request of the committee which considered this legislation the Post Office Department made a special investigation of the range of salaries paid to persons employed in business institutions throughout the country and reported the results. These investigations covered representative cities ranging in populations from 2,000 to over 5,000,000. It was found that in all cases of employees of a similar character the average salaries paid were much lower than those paid in the Postal Service.

That is the statement made by the President in his veto message.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator from South Dakota will allow me one further interruption I will promise not to interrupt him again, for I realize his time is limited.

Mr. NORBECK. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. As was well established yesterday in a colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and myself, in quoting from the report of the Postmaster General, it seems possible to obtain almost any figures.

COMPARISONS

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, the only attempt that I have heard made by any Senator to prove that the postal employees' wages are lower than the wages of others engaged in "similar work" was to make a comparison with some other Government employees. Our attention was called to the fact that when salaries were fixed for a certain service about a year ago some of them were put on the basis of \$50 a year higher than the postal employees are now getting. If we should to-day increase the wages of post-office employees \$300 a year, it would be \$250 higher than the others are getting. What will these other Government employees say to us to-morrow. They will certainly be able to prove to us that they are underpaid, notwithstanding the increase that they received about a year ago.

No one will contend that it is fair to compare the wages of Government employees with those of the building trades. Hod carriers, masons, and others have seasonal employment. They are idle a considerable part of the time. The work and the pay is uncertain, and there are no provisions made for retirement when old age comes.

A strong demand comes to me from one of our cities in South Dakota, which is the county seat of one of the largest and most prosperous counties. The demand was insistent that postal employees who were getting \$1,500 to \$1,800 a year were entitled to the \$300 increase. I inquired from the county clerk as to what salaries were paid county employees at the courthouse and found that it is an average of \$1,056. The highest salary paid is \$1,200 a year.

Among the many appeals I have received was one from a man in the service who has spent approximately 20 years in schools and colleges. With just pride he calls attention to the fact that he is a doctor of philosophy by virtue of a university degree, and he asks whether the compensation paid by the Government is adequate for a man of such splendid qualifications. I admit I am sorry for this man, because the public will not yet stand for being charged 1 cent extra on mail matter delivered by a Ph. D. We may pay a bonus on higher education some time, but it is impossible to do it with the public in the present frame of mind, for the man who was so handicapped that he was unable to secure a better education is unwilling to contribute to those who were more fortunate.

COMPARISON WITH FARMERS' INCOMES

A Congressman representing a large city asked support for this measure on the ground that the mail carriers of his city were getting only eighteen hundred dollars a year—approximately \$6 a day. We have no available statistics as to what the farmer's income is at the present time, but everybody recognizes that the farmer is in a worse predicament than he was before the war. We do have official information as to what the farmer's income was in the pre-war period. I wish to read now from a communication from the Bureau of the Census, which reads in part as follows:

Concerning the farmer's income, in 1916 there was prepared and issued by the office of farm management, Department of Agriculture, a bulletin (No. 746) on the farmer's income, by Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser. This bulletin showed that the wages of the average farmer are about \$600, composed of about \$200 in cash and about \$400 supplied by the farm. This is the best thing I know of on that subject.

It is admitted that there is an inequality of salaries between different classes of employees of the Post Office Department. It would be highly desirable if these inequalities could be adjusted. Some of the postmasters at the smaller places are getting very little compensation, and the rural mail carriers in certain sections have unusual expense. But we are called upon to support a flat increase of about \$300 a year, or to vote against it.

Every mail brings applications from young men who want to enter the Postal Service—they want a clerkship or they want a rural route. They are keenly alive to the fact that under the present compensation rates, the Government job is more profitable than farming or any other line of employment open to them, not to mention the retirement or pension feature which

now includes this service, part of which expense will be borne by the Government.

WHO PAYS THE \$65,000,000?

It is admitted that the increased expense under this bill will be about \$65,000,000 per year, but it is argued that this will not fall heavily upon anyone. We are told that it is just a little here and a little there and that it is not much anywhere. The suggestion is a mystery in finance—getting something for nothing. We are told that it will not affect the consumer, because it is the merchant who pays most of it, or it is the manufacturer who will pay it.

These are the same arguments that have been used in defense of tariff schedules, of increase in freight rates, or to justify the increased wage of union plasterers.

If these increases are not responsible for higher price levels or higher cost of living, then will some Member of this body tell me what has brought to us the higher price levels and the higher cost of living? It is a well-known and admitted fact that at present we have the highest wages ever known in peace times; but it is claimed, and apparently proven, that in many cases the workingman is no better off than he was in 1913, because the higher price levels bringing about the higher cost of living have absorbed the wage increase. It is even claimed by post-office employees that in spite of the substantial increase they have received, the high cost of living has overtaken it and absorbed it. I do not subscribe to the theory that doubling all wages to-day would make the workingman better off. He would be better off to-morrow, but in six months or a year the higher costs would be reflected in the cost of merchandise, the cost of transportation, and the cost of service.

"COST OF LIVING" DETERMINED BY WAGE STANDARDS

When a group of people get a wage increase they will be comparatively better off than others. That is another way of saying that they will be better off at the expense of the others. But we know from past experience that there is a general leveling tendency in the matter of these wages and salaries, and when one group has been given an advance over the others, it results in stimulation along the whole line. The Adamson-McAdoo railroad program resulted in better pay for railroad employees. For the time being they felt that they were exceptionally well taken care of, but now they are perplexed when they find that the higher price levels and the higher cost of living have absorbed so much of the increase.

It is amusing indeed now to listen to the argument of the conservative Senators, who a year ago insisted that the high surtaxes and even the excess-profits taxes were in the end borne by the consumer and not by the business itself. It was argued that any increase in the cost of doing business invariably resulted in higher-priced goods and that the consumer did not only bear the burden of the tax but that it had a pyramidal effect, because business added the tax to the cost of its goods and passed it along in ever-increasing ratios from manufacturer to wholesaler, from wholesaler to retailer, and from retailer to consumer, and that the one-dollar tax paid by the manufacturer resulted in from three to six dollars additional being collected from the consumer. If this argument was sound at that time, it is sound now. Possibly the three-dollar-per-family expense under the proposed bill would result in a ten-dollar-per-family tax actually being collected. The logic is the same as that used in defense of the Mellon plan.

When higher price levels come along the Government employee comes back to Congress and says, "While my wages have been increased, they have not been increased as fast as the cost of living has increased. Therefore I must have another raise."

THE FARMER'S 60-CENT DOLLAR

Agriculture is the only basic industry of the Northwest. Its progress and even its very existence are dependent upon a fair exchange price between what the farmer produces and what he buys. The new price levels have nearly ruined the American farmer. For the last four years his dollar has had a purchasing power of only about 60 cents. The new price levels did not injure the manufacturer, the wholesaler, or the retailer, who could protect themselves by a new scale of prices. They did not ruin the professional man. Doctors, lawyers, and school teachers have succeeded in securing additional compensation to meet the new conditions. None suffered who could pass the costs along to some one else.

EFFECT ON RAILROADS

A heavy tribute has been levied on the Northwest by the increased freight rates, made necessary by the higher operating costs of railroad companies, the largest factor of which is wage

increase. The Government Treasury made up the deficiency for several years, after which rates were again increased and thereafter frequently increased. The preliminary report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1923, just issued, shows that the dividends paid by railroads are equal to about one-twentieth part of the revenue collected. This means that a 5 per cent reduction in railroad rates would practically confiscate the property. Such a reduction in rates would be only 1 cent per hundred on grain where the freight rate is 20 cents. The prospect for substantial relief from high transportation rates seems remote.

WESTERN MINING INDUSTRIES

The gold and silver mining industries of the West have suffered from the same causes. It was profitable to work ore that went for \$10 a ton as long as the cost of operation was only \$6 a ton, but when the cost of operation advanced to \$10 a ton, the mine was closed up. The new cost level put it out of business in the same way that it is putting so many farmers out of business, for the cost of operation increased and the price of the product remained stationary.

If hundreds of millions of dollars are added to the cost of doing business, directly or indirectly, it must be absorbed by somebody. It is admitted that the manufacturer and the merchant and many others can pass the costs along. Everyone admits that the farmer is unable to do so. Does it not, therefore, necessarily follow that the farmers and a few other lines bear the whole loss resulting from a change in price levels? The farmer is the main shock absorber.

Not that his prices of farm products are so low in dollars, but that his margin of profit has been wiped out by the increased cost of that which he must buy, be it service or material. He can not exchange a day's labor with anybody. When the average farmer had a net profit of \$600 before the war he was comparatively well off. He is hoping that he can get back to this pre-war basis.

EFFECT OF FOREIGN CROP FAILURES

I know it was often said last fall that the farmers are "getting back to normal." It is true there has been an improved situation in the northwestern wheat districts, where crops were good and prices were better. When General Dawes came west during the recent campaign to discuss the agricultural problem he might easily have called attention to the temporary improvement in the situation. If he had done so, he would have misled many people, but he was courageous and faced the issue squarely. He said frankly in his Lincoln, Nebr., speech that conditions were better on account of crop failures in Canada and other countries, and that we must recognize the fact that the improvement was of a temporary nature only. To hold otherwise is to ignore plain facts. It is like the case of the soldier in the German army who wrote home, "The French all have the flu, so our trouble is about over with." Even with the present better prices the exchange value of the farmer's products is away below normal, or pre-war levels. The exchange value of cattle is as low as it was during the Cleveland Administration in the early nineties, when distress throughout the agricultural region was universal.

VIEWS OF PROGRESSIVE SENATORS

I am frankly surprised that so many of the Senators from the Northwest are going to support this measure, but I will admit that it is not my first surprise. Three years ago I listened to dozens of speeches on the proposal to reduce the income taxes from 70 per cent to 50 per cent. We were told that 50 per cent was entirely too low and that the proposed reduction was for the benefit of the rich, and that it was immoral. The same speeches were made by regular Democrats and by irregular Republicans. Each group claimed to be the more progressive. Each protested as loudly as possible against the proposed reduction. Some of them objected on the ground that if the tax burden was reduced on big incomes it would be to the disadvantage of the farmers. But the proposed tax-reduction measure was passed over their violent protest by conservative Members of Congress, largely from Eastern States. I joined with the irregular Republicans and cast my vote against these tax reductions, feeling that relief for the Northwest should be coupled with relief for other sections; otherwise we would be left out in the cold.

RECORD REVERSED IN TWO YEARS

Inside of two short years I noticed a complete change of heart—or shall I say a change of mind? The bill further reducing taxes on large incomes from 50 per cent to 40 per cent secured the support of nearly every Senator who had protested so loudly against the previous bill reducing the maximum income taxes from 70 to 50 per cent. The progressive Senators from the agricultural Northwest did not even insist that these

tax reductions should be accompanied by agricultural relief. They hastened to give relief to the large taxpayers, and I again found myself occupying a lonesome position. Of course, it is possible that these Senators were right and I was wrong. They may have become convinced that the higher income taxes did not work for the general welfare. They seemed finally to have accepted the argument of the conservative Senators, that the taxes were pyramided and the costs passed on to the ultimate consumer.

It is an admitted fact that the depreciation of the farmer's dollar is due to higher cost levels. He buys his supplies in the American market, manufactured under the American standard. The prices on his products are fixed by the world's market. He, and he alone, is in competition with foreign labor. American industries and American labor are protected against competition. At the demand of labor, the Federal Government and the States have shortened the working-day and increased the pay. Immigration laws have been passed to protect them. Practically every class has sought relief and received it—at the farmer's expense. For 40 years he has supported labor in every struggle for better conditions, only to find himself now the poorest-paid laborer in the land. When he asked that Congress also put him on the same basis with others, opposition arose in many quarters. Organized industry and organized labor both gave him a deaf ear. It was one of the leading progressive Congressmen who led the fight against the "ratio price" for agricultural products. In this he had the support of the Wall Street Journal, which also protested against the increase in the prices of grains and meats. The farmer wanted to be a comrade of labor but the door was closed to him.

It appears to me that the proposed \$65,000,000 increase, which is about three dollars for each family, will not be the measure of our increased burden under this act. The pyramiding effect of it may make the tax eight or ten dollars on every family, but even this may be only a small part of the actual effect of the bill. It may be that it is only one more step toward higher price levels and higher cost of living, which inside of a year may result in several times ten dollars being the actual cost on each family. If it operates in the same way as other tax burdens or impediments that have been placed upon business, it will result in multiplying the burden created by this measure. The next step will be that the other wage earners will come forward and show that the higher cost of living has absorbed their wages, and in a short time these same postal employees will come back to Congress and be able to prove that the increased wages have left them in no better shape than before. This round of increasing wages that brings the high cost of living has by some one been dubbed the "vicious circle." Where are we going to stop? If we are unable and unwilling to put agriculture on a fair and equitable basis, let us at least refrain from putting an additional burden upon the farmer. He is trying to get back to a pre-war basis when his dollar was at par and his earnings were \$600 per year. I can not vote to take from him any more of his scant income. He has a bigger load than he can carry now.

We believe in the square deal—that the laborer is worthy of his hire. But the square deal demands, substantially, equality. This bill does not contribute to that end. We can not get back to normal by this route. If it is impossible to bring the wages of all laborers, including the farmers, up to the present levels, then it becomes necessary to travel in the other direction, or at least call a halt. Let us not make the situation any worse for those who are in the deepest distress at the present time.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, with a few exceptions I favor the general increases of salaries proposed in Senate bill 1898. As a member of the joint committee, I endeavored to attend and did attend nearly all of the hearings. They were extended. The question of salaries was gone into very exhaustively. All who desired to be heard were given time; and I believe without exception the members of the joint committee were convinced that the employees were entitled to consideration, and should have increases in their salaries.

The work of that committee was not nearly as difficult as that of one of the former committees, which was known as the reclassification committee of 1920, on which I also had the honor to serve. That committee found it necessary to change the differentials as between employees in almost every branch of the service; and while they had taken months to complete their work, based on very extended inquiries, when the bill which became a law on January 5, 1920, was put into effect it was generally satisfactory to the employees in the Postal Service. There were but two or three slight corrections which it was found necessary to make by subsequent legislation.

At that time it was the belief of the committee that the postal employees had at least been put on an equality with other wage earners performing similar duties, or, at least, duties of as much importance. It was expected that the cost of living, which was then showing signs of decline, would further decrease. Unfortunately for those employees, this expectation was not borne out, and the records produced in our hearings of last year showed conclusively that it was costing them more to live than it had during 1920 and 1921.

The joint special committee agreed on schedules of rates and submitted them in the form of a bill to the committees of the two Houses. In the meantime they had under discussion the proposals put forward by the Post Office Committee for increases in salaries which would have carried a total annual increase of about \$43,000,000. Included in those proposals was one to establish a differential as between employees who resided in populous centers and those who worked in rural districts. That was carefully considered, and it was the conclusion of the joint committee that it was not practicable, that it would be almost impossible to put it into effect, and that it could not at least satisfy a majority of those who would have to work under the new salary schedules.

The outline of the Post Office Department bill also carries provisions for meeting the cost of the proposed increase of \$43,000,000, but at that time the work of the cost ascertainment committee was dovetailing into the work of the Post Office Department to determine what it cost to handle the four different classes of mail and what the receipts from those various classes amounted to.

Unfortunately, those figures were not available for your joint committee. The work was not even far enough along to enable us to make an intelligent guess at what the findings would be. The committee was therefore under the necessity of reporting a bill without any scientific basis upon which to recommend increases in postal rates for the various classes of mail matter. There was quite a discussion on that point at various meetings. The majority of the members, however, felt that it was not possible for them intelligently to recommend increases in postal rates.

The bill as recommended to the committees of the two Houses would have carried about \$56,000,000 of annual increases in salaries. When considered in the House and in the Senate amendments were offered which in the Senate alone, as I recall it, increased the appropriation about eight or nine million dollars, whereas the House made amendments which raised the total to about \$80,000,000. The bill went to conference, and after days of consideration it was reported back to the two Houses carrying a total of about \$68,000,000, and met the approval of the Senate and of the House. That is the form in which Senate bill 1898 now comes before us for consideration.

The work of the cost ascertainment committee was concluded after the adjournment of the Congress, after the passage of Senate bill 1898. That work was carried on in a scientific manner. I believe the findings to be dependable. The amount that was expended in money and in labor was very large, an appropriation of \$500,000 having been made for the purpose. There is every reason to believe that the work was honestly and efficiently performed and that the findings are as accurate as it is humanly possible to make them.

I believe that a readjustment of the postal rates should be based upon that cost ascertainment, and that those rates should be advanced in an amount sufficient to offset and take care of any advances in postal salaries. I have always favored fair and liberal treatment of the employees in the Postal Service. They devote their lives to the business. They follow it as a profession. They are able, conscientious, faithful servants and entitled to proper consideration and treatment.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is a businesslike proposition to advance the cost with one hand without at the same time providing with the other for the payment of added costs, particularly when it is so apparent that the means of raising the added costs are available. Those means are proper; they should be above criticism. No one could be criticized for advocating an advance of postal rates when we know that the service is well worth to those that are served all that it costs. The service is cheap. The Post Office Department is one department to which we have always pointed as being carried along on business principles comparable to those of the biggest business of the United States or the world itself. The postal employees are certainly entitled to receive adequate compensation for their labor. No more faithful or dependable people could be gotten in any business than those who are to-day employed in our Post Office Department.

Mr. President, this seems to me a straight business proposition. Those people should be duly and properly compensated. The service which they perform, the service which the Government renders its citizens, should be compensated for also. We have the data on which to determine what compensation should be given from the citizens who are served for the service the Post Office Department is rendering to them. To my mind, this is the time for the Congress to determine what the cost of the service should be on the different classes of mail matter that are handled by the Post Office Department.

I feel strongly that the veto of the President of Senate bill 1898 should be sustained. I propose to vote to sustain it, in the full belief that the Senate, which already has before it a bill which has been reported out of committee looking to the increase of salaries of the employees, will give that bill consideration. There is ample time in which to take up and dispose of that legislation before the date fixed for the adjournment of this Congress. When Congress desires to take up and consider that legislation, it will do so without interfering with any other question before it.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I ask the Senator to yield merely that I may put a statement in the RECORD. The Senator from South Dakota asked the authority on which I based my statement that hod carriers were receiving a salary of approximately \$36 a week, and that other lines of industry were receiving salaries in excess of the 60 cents an hour paid letter carriers their first year. With the consent of the Senate I would like to have inserted in the RECORD portions of a table covering this point from the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, December, 1924.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average rate of wages per hour, May, 1924

TRADE	
Bakers	\$0.946
BUILDING TRADES	
Asbestos workers	1.122
Bricklayers	1.398
Sewer, tunnel, and caisson	1.608
Building laborers	.809
Carpenters	1.160
Millwrights	1.251
Parquetry floor layers	1.262
Wharf and bridge	1.070
Cement finishers	1.231
Helpers	.895
Composition roofers	1.131
Helpers	.721
Elevator constructors	1.252
Helpers	.888
Engineers, portable and hoisting	1.213
Glaziers	1.099
Hod carriers	.823
Inside wiremen	1.207
Fixture hangers	1.149
Lathers:	
Piecework	per day 8.230
Time-work	1.282
Marble setters	1.242
Helpers	.946
Mosaic and terrazzo workers	1.155
Painters	1.168
Fresco	1.057
Sign	1.515
Plasterers	1.461
Laborers	.937
Plumbers and gas fitters	1.255

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, early last spring as I walked out of my office in the Senate Office Building one day I could see Senators falling over themselves to get to the room of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, in order that they might appear before that committee, which was then writing the so-called Edge bill. I do not recall now whether my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] was among that lot or not, but he was on the committee, as I recall now, and was one of the influential Senators who helped to frame that bill and gave it the stamp of his approval; and the Senator who has just finished his speech [Mr. PHIPPS], saying that he was going to vote to sustain the President's veto, was, as I remember, a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Edge bill, which the President has vetoed.

May I call to the Senate's attention at this time that before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, when this bill was being framed, certain Senators who now are going to vote

to sustain the President's veto appeared and spoke eloquently for the bill?

I see before me my friend the Hon. FREDERICK HALE. I do not know how he will vote at this particular time, but generally when the President pops the whip he dances. He appeared before the committee, as shown by this record, and spoke for the legislation.

We go a little further. Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH appeared before the committee. I do not know what he will do at this time, but if he flickers this time it will be the first time that the distinguished senior Senator from New York has ever flickered, whether the whip was popped by the President or not. I imagine that he will not change his views respecting the President's veto.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. DALE. I simply want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there have been occasions here on the floor of the Senate when the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] stood true, fixed, and constant as the north star. I think, if the Senator will refresh his memory and go back over the past few months, he will find one very conspicuous example of the steadfastness of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped he would stand as fixed as the north star on this vote. But when "the roll is called" we will see.

I see that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] appeared before the committee, and if he changes on this vote, it will be the first time that he has shown a lack of courage in his votes in this body.

I see here the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPEL]. He made about the longest speech that was made before the committee in support of the Edge bill. I tried to find, in the pages of this report, where his colleague [Mr. CURTIS] appeared before the committee; but he was too smart for that. I am wondering if the change of front on the part of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPEL] is because he wants to uphold the hands of his colleague as new leader of this body, or of the President of the United States. What is he going to say to this host of men, the postal employees, to whom he swore allegiance when he appeared before this committee and pleaded for a favorable report of the Edge bill?

I see by this report that the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] appeared before the committee. Has he changed front? What has come over the spirit of his dreams that causes him to change?

Oh, I looked into the pages to see if my friend from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], who will not be with us, I am sorry to say, after the 4th of March, appeared before the committee; but he did not. His vote was all right when the bill was first passed. I do not know how he will vote this time on this proposition.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] has just made an eloquent speech. He said much to the committee in asking that the Edge bill be reported out. No more eloquent speech was made before the committee, and yet to-day he blows another way. He speaks differently. He would uphold the hands of the President.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HARRISON. I gladly yield.

Mr. ODDIE. The Senator from Nevada is still in favor of the salary increase bill, but the Senator from Nevada is honestly in favor of getting it through, and he is using no obstructive tactics to prevent the passage of a bill which will carry the increased postal rates.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator voted for the bill, did he not?

Mr. ODDIE. Yes; he voted for it.

Mr. HARRISON. And he is going to vote to sustain the President now, is he not?

Mr. ODDIE. Yes; he is going to vote to sustain the President; and he has already voted, as a member of the subcommittee, to report a bill which will take its place, which is a more logical bill, and which he believes the people of the country will support earnestly.

Mr. HARRISON. The new bill carries with it the same salaries that were carried in the one which the President has vetoed, does it not?

Mr. ODDIE. It does.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator think that the quickest way for him to get the salaries raised is to vote to override the President's veto?

Mr. ODDIE. The Senator from Nevada thinks that the best way to do it is the intelligent and honest way. I know that Senators on this floor may differ with me, and I feel that they may have an honest difference of opinion, and I am not questioning their motives; but I do say to the Senator from Mississippi that I believe he should handle this matter in a serious manner, because the postal employees are an honest lot of men who are entitled to consideration and help, which they deserve, and I believe that in taking this attitude the Senator from Mississippi is hurting their cause.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure the Senator does think that way; but the men who represent the postal employees, and the postal employees themselves, do not think that way.

I shall not read further the list that is incorporated in these hearings of men who appeared before the committee.

But may I say that two months before the President vetoed the Edge bill, another bill was handed to him, after having been passed through the Congress, which carried large increases in salaries. It pertained to the Postal Service of the country. It did not give increases to the men who make only \$1,100, \$1,200, or \$1,400 a year salary, but it gave increases of \$2,500 a year to men who were already receiving \$5,000 a year. I have here a list of the increases carried in the bill of April 4, 1924. It provided no corresponding way of raising revenue to pay for the increases. It gave to those men varying increases; for instance, to the appointment clerk and personnel officer, who was receiving \$2,240, it gave an increase to \$3,000. I ask permission to incorporate in the RECORD this long list of increases given to the highly paid members of the Postal Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Designation	Fiscal year 1924, total rate	Fiscal year 1925, salary rate
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Administrative assistant.....		\$6,000
Personal officer or appointment clerk.....	\$2,240	3,000
Assistant to chief clerk.....	2,240	3,300
Confidential clerk to the Postmaster General.....	2,240	(*)
Chief inspector.....	4,000	5,200
Chief clerk to chief inspector.....	2,240	3,000
Purchasing agent.....	4,000	5,200
Chief clerk to purchasing agent.....	2,240	3,000
Solicitor.....	5,000	6,000
Assistant attorney.....	4,500	5,200
Law clerk.....	2,040	3,000
Administrative assistant to the First Assistant Postmaster General.....		3,000
Assistant chief clerk, First Assistant Postmaster General.....		3,000
Special assistant, division of Post Office Service.....		2,700
Clerk.....	2,140	2,700
Assistant mechanical engineer.....		3,000
OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
First Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, First Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of Post Office Service.....	4,000	5,200
Assistant superintendent, division of Post Office Service.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent, division of postmasters' appointments.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent, division of post-office and garage quarters.....		3,800
Assistant superintendent, division of post-office and garage quarters.....		3,000
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of railway adjustments.....	3,000	3,800
Assistant superintendent, division of railway adjustments.....	2,490	3,000
General superintendent, division of Railway Mail Service.....	4,000	5,200
Chief clerk, division of Railway Mail Service.....	2,240	3,000
OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of stamps.....	2,750	3,300
Superintendent, division of finance.....	2,490	3,000
Superintendent, division of classification.....	2,750	3,800
Superintendent, division of registered mails.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of money orders.....	2,750	3,800
OFFICE OF THE FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of rural mails.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent of engineering.....		6,000
Assistant superintendent of engineering.....		3,800
Superintendent, division of equipment and supplies.....	3,000	3,800

* New.

* Dropped in lieu of administrative assistant.

Mr. HARRISON. The list shows that every Assistant Postmaster General received an increase in salary from \$5,000 to \$7,500 a year. Indeed, the salary of Mr. Stewart, who it is said suggested certain language in the veto message, was increased from \$6,000 to \$7,500 a year, but not a word was said by the President when he approved that bill concerning the raising of revenue from the Postal Service to pay for those very large increases. Those of the inner circle were taken care of—but not the little fellow—the under-paid employee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator wants to be perfectly fair. Those increases were to carry out the law known as the reclassification act passed by Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The President had nothing to do after the law was passed. Those salaries came under the law that Congress itself passed, and the President had nothing whatever to do about paying those salaries.

Mr. HARRISON. I admit the Senator is right in his observation but, Mr. President, the pending bill is largely carrying out suggestions of the reclassification commission also.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HARRISON. And the postal employees are certainly entitled to the increases just as much as were the others.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying they were not entitled to the increases. I simply want the RECORD to be correct. Those employees were not involved in the reclassification act, and they have not been in the past paid the same as other regular employees of the Government. They have been provided for in the post office appropriation act, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HARRISON. Here is what the President said in his reasons for vetoing the bill:

Certainly the interests of the people demand that any legislation increasing the cost of the Postal Service should give consideration to the raising of the moneys necessary to defray the additional cost.

Further in that message he said:

It is apparent that the matter of increasing the salaries of postal employees should be considered in connection with the ways and means whereby the postal revenues may be correspondingly increased, and apart therefrom.

The point I make is that the President signed his name to a bill on April 4 last which gave increases ranging from \$500 to \$2,500 to the highly paid postal employees here in the District of Columbia without suggesting and without the Senator from Utah suggesting, because he helped to draft the bill, any way to raise revenue from the Postal Service to pay for those increases. I am wondering why it is that Senators can defend such a proposition or believe in increases of \$2,500 upon salaries of \$5,000 and deny an increase to the man who is eking out a mere existence, receiving a salary of \$1,400 a year, refusing to give him a mere \$300 increase. Senators can not stand here and defend that proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the Senator had talked this way when we had the reclassification bill before the Senate for consideration. I think I was the only Senator here who made objection to its provisions.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the Senator votes against everything except those things intended for Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I resent that statement because it is not so.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the statement then. Of course, the Senator votes for some things outside of Utah. Whenever the special interests ask him he always votes for them.

Mr. SMOOT. I will not bother the Senator again, but I simply want to say that the Senator voted for the law which he is now criticizing.

Mr. HARRISON. I am in favor of increased salaries. I am in favor of increased salaries all down the line.

Mr. SMOOT. So am I.

Mr. HARRISON. I voted for those increases in the Postal Service to the highly paid, and I crave an opportunity to vote to override the President's veto and give the poorly paid postal employees an increase in salary.

Not only did the President fail or refuse to suggest, when he signed the bill containing these very large increases, that Congress should provide ways and means to pay the increases, but what further did he do? Let us see, and the Senator from Utah is just as guilty as other members of the Appropriations Committee on this proposition. Up until three years ago the employees in the Postal Service in the District of Columbia were paid out of the General Treasury. The Sena-

tor from Utah nods his head in approval. In the last three appropriation bills, including the one now on the calendar and just reported by the Committee on Appropriations carrying these large increases to the highly paid postal employees, those salaries were drawn out of the postal revenues of the Government, and they amount to \$4,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say again to the Senator, if he is referring to me in connection with this matter, and I hope he will pardon me for interrupting him again, that the whole basis of the change was the reclassification act. That is where it came in, and the Senator knows it, too. What the Senator said is true, that they were paid out of the general fund until three years ago.

Mr. HARRISON. And now they come out of the postal revenues and amount to some \$4,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And there is nothing in the law that shows that upon its face.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows why it was done. There was not a Senator here who objected to it when it was proposed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to suggest, and I want to suggest to the Senator from Utah as well, is not the increase to which the Senator from Mississippi refers due to allocation made under the reclassification act?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I said.

Mr. HARRISON. But they get it, and the President signed the bill and suggested no way to raise the revenue out of the Postal Service to pay for those large increases.

Mr. STERLING. The President did not have anything to do with the particular allocations that were made, did not know how they were made, and did not have charge of that feature of the work.

Mr. HARRISON. I have read from the record of those distinguished Senators who appealed to the committee to report out the bill and made eloquent speeches for it, and who now are about to vote to sustain the President's veto. I hope the time will soon come when the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will pass this body and become a law. Legislation such as is embodied in this veto should not be decided by "lame ducks."

I want to incorporate in the RECORD the names of some of the Members of this body who went down to defeat in the recent November election who voted for this bill when it passed, and then I want those who read the RECORD to watch their votes in sustaining the President at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

The list is as follows:

BALL, of Delaware.

BURSUM, of New Mexico.

MCCORMICK, of Illinois.

STERLING, of South Dakota.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, my views as to the merits of this measure have been many times and publicly stated. Those views were made known by my well-considered vote in favor of the passage of this bill on May 27, 1924. Nothing has occurred, no facts have been brought to my attention, no arguments have been advanced, to change the views I then entertained and deliberately expressed.

I then believed, I now believe, with unfeigned respect for the opinion of others, that this is a meritorious and just measure. I content myself by merely stating my position without detaining the Senate to assign the reasons which in my opinion fully justify that position. I take a certain satisfaction, perhaps comfort, however, in the knowledge that the views I entertain are shared by the great State whence I come and whose devotion to the President has been so strikingly demonstrated.

I believe, Mr. President, I reverently believe, in our representative form of government—a Republic, not a democracy—and hence I believe in paying decent respect to the mature and deliberate opinion of those who commission me to speak and act for them. I lay aside all personalities. I never indulge in personalities. Even though I differ radically from positions taken by others, I never question the motives of honorable men. Not by way of criticism of what has occurred or been uttered in the course of debate, I venture to think that a just cause is not advanced or retarded by personalities or indulging in reflections upon the motives which actuate honorable and earnest men.

I shall not detain the Senate to read what I had originally intended to submit, but if agreeable I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated in the RECORD the names of certain of my constituents who have called upon me, appealed to me, to speak and act as I am speaking, and as I shall act this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

From chambers of commerce and commercial organizations in California:

Hayward Chamber of Commerce, Hayward; F. C. Leach, president; Jacob Harder, jr., secretary.

Madera County Chamber of Commerce, Madera; E. E. Nelson, president.

Pomona Valley Merchants Credit Association, Pomona.
Dinuba Chamber of Commerce; J. J. Lushbaugh, president.
Merchants Credit Association of San Luis Obispo; Oscar A. Nilsson, president; E. D. Sworthout, secretary.

Business Men's Association, Red Bluff; W. H. Fisher, president.
Santa Ana Realty Board, Santa Ana; Freeman H. Bloodgood, chairman of law and legislative committee.

Valley Industrial Association, Fresno.
San Pedro Realty Board, San Pedro.

Petaluma Chamber of Commerce; A. Young, president; C. A. Miller, secretary.

Paso Robles Merchants Association, Paso Robles; D. B. Clifford, secretary.

Burbank Chamber of Commerce, Burbank; A. E. BuFur, president.
Chamber of Commerce, Dinuba; James J. Lushbaugh, president.
The Boosters' Club, Bakersfield; W. B. Morgan, secretary.

Greater Highland Park Association, Highland Park, Los Angeles; Leland S. Davis, president.

Exchange Club, Glendale; R. E. Johnston, president; T. F. Culhane, secretary.

Ontario Business Men's Association, Ontario; F. H. Wallihan, secretary.

Los Angeles Realty Board, Los Angeles; Tom Ingersoll, secretary.
San Pedro Realty Board, San Pedro; F. M. Cuddey, secretary.

Chamber of Commerce, Huntington Beach, by J. A. Armitage, secretary.

Los Feliz Improvement Association, Los Angeles; Mrs. Morgan D. Griffith, secretary.

San Bernardino Chamber of Commerce, San Bernardino; Dwight F. Towne, president; R. H. Mack, secretary.

Fresno Realty Board, Fresno; Harvey Humphrey, secretary.
San Diego Truck Owners' Association, San Diego; Harold W. Dill, secretary-manager.

Whittier Chamber of Commerce, Whittier; M. J. Haig, secretary.
The Chamber of Commerce, Wilmington; Lou W. Johnson, secretary-manager.

Good Government League, Burlingame; W. F. Crosby, secretary.
Truck Owners' Association of Southern California, Los Angeles; A. S. Malstead, secretary.

Eureka Valley Promotion Association, by M. S. Silva, secretary.
Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento; Charles R. Jones, vice president.

Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo; T. J. Ohara, president.
Chamber of Commerce, Nevada City; E. J. N. Ott, president.

Wilmington Chamber of Commerce (board of directors), Wilmington.
Orange Chamber of Commerce, Orange.

Anaheim Chamber of Commerce, Anaheim; Harry D. Riley, president.

Junior Chamber of Commerce, Santa Ana; B. E. Switzer, secretary.
Venice Chamber of Commerce, Venice.

Chamber of Commerce, Pacific Grove; A. C. Jochmus, secretary.
Chamber of Commerce, Corning.

Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce, Red Bluff.
Napa Chamber of Commerce, Napa; John D. Cochrane, president.

Coalinga Chamber of Commerce, Coalinga.
Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce, Santa Clara; George L. Sullivan, president.

Chamber of Commerce, Santa Cruz; Leslie Cranbourne, secretary.
Chamber of Commerce, Glendale; W. E. Hewitt, president.

North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento; George C. Bliss, secretary; John S. Lawson, president.

South San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, South San Francisco; P. R. Thompson, manager.

Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, Hollywood; Carl Bush, secretary.
Tulare Board of Trade, Tulare; J. F. Held, jr., president.

From banks, trust companies, and brokers of California:
Motley H. Flint, executive vice president Pacific-Southwest Trust & Savings Bank, Los Angeles.

Security Trust & Savings Bank, Los Angeles.

Robert A. Fatjo, manager Bank of Italy, Santa Clara.

First National Bank, Madera.

Pacific-Southwest Trust & Savings Bank, Tulare; L. L. Abercrombie, manager.

Farmers State Bank, Tulare; W. D. Cook, president.

First National Bank, Tulare; W. E. Dunlap, vice president.

Bank of Tehama County, Red Bluff.

The Red Bluff National Bank, Red Bluff.

Anaheim National Bank, Anaheim.

Kenneth B. Wilson, manager Citizens Trust & Savings Bank, Los Angeles.

John A. Herron, Midwest Investment Bureau, San Diego.

Wm. R. Staats Co. (bonds), San Diego.

H. P. Regua, Southern Trust & Commerce Bank, National City.

E. H. McGrath, vice president Community Building & Loan Association, San Diego.

R. E. Gegg, secretary San Diego Building & Loan Association, San Diego.

M. T. Gilmore, president San Diego Savings Bank, San Diego.

Doane Merrill, president Pasadena National Bank, Pasadena.

R. C. MacArthur, cashier Daly City Bank, Daly City.

Karl R. Lewis, vice president The First National Bank, Dinuba.

Merchants National Bank of Sacramento.

From publishers and editors, as follows:

J. Emmett Olmsted, publisher Argus, Petaluma.

H. A. Charters, Tulare Daily Register, Tulare.

W. L. Miller, editor Eagle Rock Sentinel, Glendale.

J. S. Daley, editor Reporter, Glendale.

Stockton Labor Journal, Stockton.

J. R. Locke, editor Dinuba Daily Sentinel, Dinuba.

The Humboldt Beacon, Eureka.

Daily News Leader, San Mateo.

A. W. Gluckman, proprietor Democrat, Marysville.

George A. Oakes, Hayward Journal, Hayward.

Publisher Turlock Daily Journal, Turlock.

D. R. Hanhart, editor Madera Mercury, Madera.

H. A. Clark, editor Tribune, Madera.

E. P. Sherman, editor News, Modesto.

Fred Weybert, publisher Salinas Daily Index, Salinas.

P. D. Nowell, owner Tulare Daily Service, Tulare.

The Plain Dealer, Anaheim.

H. S. Howard, publisher The Courier, Berkeley.

The Alta Advocate, Dinuba.

F. W. Atkinson, proprietor Watsonville Register, Watsonville.

J. M. Cremin, publisher Marysville Appeal, Marysville.

C. E. Murray, editor-owner The News, East San Diego.

Allen R. Thomson, editor The Newton Publications, Los Angeles.

Frank L. Graham, U. S. N. R. F., editor Naval Weekly, San Diego.

Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, publisher and editor The Jewish Community News, San Diego.

W. J. Serval, editor Lake Elsinore Valley Press, Elsinore.

From chairmen, secretaries, and members of Republican county central committees and of Coolidge-Dawes clubs:

Carl J. Wright, secretary Republican County Central Committee, Eureka.

R. G. Power, chairman Colusa County Republican Committee.

E. C. Barrell, jr., secretary Colusa County Republican Committee.

Hubert H. Briggs, San Joaquin County Central Committee, Stockton.

Charles Grady, chairman Republican County Central Committee, Napa.

Milo A. Cain, chairman Republican County Central Committee, Santa Cruz.

E. H. McCorkle, member County Central Committee, Dinuba.

J. H. McCracken, member County Central Committee, Dinuba.

A. C. Loges, member Tulare County Central Committee, Dinuba.

Brad J. Perry, president of Coolidge-Dawes Club, Vallejo.

H. L. Engelbright, secretary Republican County Central Committee, Nevada City.

C. E. Taylor, secretary Tulare County Central Committee (and members of Tulare County Committee), Tulare.

Frank Lamberson, chairman Republican County Central Committee, Visalia.

Philetus Bell, secretary Republican County Central Committee (also members of committee), Eureka.

Horace W. Amphlett, chairman County Central Committee, San Mateo.

E. B. Martinelli, chairman County Committee, San Rafael.

Walter F. Price, chairman County Committee, Santa Rosa.

From judges of the supreme and superior courts, mayors, and other public officials of California:

William H. Waste, associate justice Supreme Court of California.

Congressman-elect Albert E. Carter, Oakland.

Congressman-elect Lawrence J. Flaherty, San Francisco.

Charles G. Johnson, State treasurer, Sacramento.

Will C. Wood, superintendent of schools, Sacramento.
 Mayor George E. Cryer, of Los Angeles.
 Stanley Murrar, superior judge, Madera.
 L. W. Fulkner, judge of superior court, Modesto.
 Judge Henry Lewis, Los Angeles.
 George F. Herzog, justice of the peace, Marysville.
 E. A. Luce, judge superior court, San Diego.
 J. B. Griffin, city manager and city engineer, Venice.
 Walter Evans, mayor of Colton.
 H. L. Andrews, mayor of Dinuba.
 L. V. Lucas, mayor of the city of Hanford.
 E. M. Saunderson, mayor, Madera.
 D. D. Bowman, mayor of San Rafael.
 M. A. Blanchard, mayor of Huntington Park.
 E. H. Metcalf, mayor of Anaheim.
 Charles Rea, mayor of Ventura.
 R. A. Eddy, chairman Nevada County Board of Supervisors, Nevada City.

Edward F. Bryant, city tax collector, San Francisco.
 Thomas F. Boyle, auditor, San Francisco.
 Thomas F. Finn, sheriff, San Francisco.
 John Ginty, assessor, San Francisco.
 Edmond Godchaux, recorder, San Francisco.
 J. H. Zemansky, register, San Francisco.
 Edward Vanvranken, district attorney, San Joaquin County, Stockton.

Assemblyman F. B. Noyes, Marysville.
 T. H. Selva, former candidate for Congress (Republican), Eureka.
 H. C. Nelson, State senator and attorney, Eureka.
 Frank L. Coombs, attorney and State senator, Napa.
 W. C. Rhodes, county auditor, Madera.
 Mason A. Bailey, district attorney, Madera.
 J. O. Rue, county surveyor, Madera.
 J. S. Moore, county assessor, Madera.
 A. G. Paul, principal Polytechnic High School, Riverside.
 J. J. Mitchell, city treasurer, Tulare.
 E. C. W. Scruggs, city council, Dinuba.
 L. O. Byers, city trustee, Huntington Park.
 R. C. Sturgeon, supervisor second district, Tulare.
 M. B. Driver, councilman, Berkeley.
 Redmond C. Staats, supervisor Alameda County, Berkeley.
 Elmer L. Nichols, councilman, Berkeley.
 Los Angeles fire department, Los Angeles.
 Edith H. Lowry, city treasurer, of South Pasadena.
 Nettie A. Hewitt, city clerk, South Pasadena.
 Robert Dominguez, city clerk, Los Angeles.
 C. A. Hough, justices' court, Los Angeles.
 Charles B. De Long, justice of the peace, department 2, San Diego.
 John H. Ferry, county recorder, San Diego.

The employees of executive committee of department of public service of the city of Los Angeles (representing 4,000 employees), Los Angeles.

George W. Heston, treasurer San Diego County, San Diego.
 George W. Moulton, county assessor, San Diego.
 J. B. McLees, clerk of San Diego County, San Diego.
 J. E. Parrish, assistant chief San Diego fire department, San Diego.

The clerks of the city of San Diego.
 L. D. Jennings, justice of the peace, department No. 1, San Diego.
 Councilman Fred A. Heilborn, San Diego.
 Charles E. Teach, superintendent of city schools, Bakersfield.
 Louise Graf, principal Los Angeles city school district.
 L. W. Bransen, park department, Los Angeles.
 Frank A. Nance, coroner of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles.
 C. D. Skinner, board of public works, Los Angeles.
 Will Angier, assistant superintendent San Diego city schools, San Diego.

Employees of the city hall at San Francisco.
 V. M. Castagnetto, justice court, Vallejo.
 R. A. Eddy, chairman board of supervisors of Nevada County, Nevada City.

Dr. A. H. Rankin, health officer, Daly City.
 Mary Pritchard, president Woman's Club, civic organization, Colton.

D. W. Willets, president Colton National Bank, Colton.
 A. D. Ewing, county treasurer, Fresno.
 Ray W. Baker, county tax collector, Fresno.
 Judge D. A. Cashin, superior court, Fresno.
 Will Kelly, county auditor, Fresno.
 Hon. J. E. Wooley, judge superior court, Fresno.
 Herbert McDowell, assemblyman, Fresno.
 Ray L. Riley, State controller, Sacramento.
 Frank H. Cory, deputy secretary of state, Sacramento.
 J. M. Inman, State senator, Sacramento.
 Stanislaus County Board of Trade, Modesto; George T. McCabe, secretary.

Santa Monica-Ocean Park Chamber of Commerce, Ocean Park; M. C. McKenney, secretary.

Business Men's Association of Torrance, Torrance; Hiram E. Reeve, president.

Credit Association of Oroville, Oroville; John Brereton, jr., secretary.

The Visalia Commercial Club, Visalia; P. E. Ritchie, secretary.
 California State Automobile Association (Inc.), Vallejo; E. H. Bellows, district manager.

From ministers of the gospel and professional men:
 Doctors Business Bureau of California, L. S. Trigg, Los Angeles.
 Dr. T. H. Stice, Napa.

A. M. Free, D. D. S., Santa Barbara.
 Richard Belcher, Marysville.

H. W. Brunk, attorney, Berkeley.
 Dr. I. M. Burnside, Los Angeles.

Dr. C. O. Norman, Los Angeles.
 Dr. Philip E. Zeiss, Burbank.

F. S. Blackinton, Los Angeles.
 Dr. Sumner J. Quint, Los Angeles.

Dr. E. F. Frederick, Monrovia.
 Calvert Wilson, attorney, Los Angeles.

Thomas C. Job, attorney, Los Angeles.
 Dr. J. K. Weber, Pasadena College of Chiropractic, Pasadena.

Edward D. Gaylord, minister, the Church of the Messiah, Los Angeles.

William M. Brown, lawyer, Los Angeles.
 O. D. Wonder, minister, Evangelical Church, San Diego.

Dr. John E. Garver, Los Angeles.
 Crandall & Welch, attorneys, Los Angeles.

Dr. H. Health Engmark, chiropractor, Los Angeles.
 Dr. W. S. Williams, minister, the Presbyterian Church, East San Diego.

Hendee & Rodabaugh, attorneys, San Diego.
 Dr. N. D. Laughlin, San Diego.

Dr. Francis Lee Clemens, San Diego.
 Dr. Ambrose C. Stewart, San Diego.

Dr. W. R. Byars, San Diego.
 Dr. W. G. Oliver, San Diego.

Dr. James F. Churchill, San Diego.
 Carl Alex Johnson, San Diego.

Rev. W. E. Crabtree, Central Christian Church, San Diego.
 Clewell Chiropractic College, San Diego.

Dr. Nelson C. Oakly, San Diego.
 J. C. Hizar, attorney, San Diego.

Dr. L. B. Waggoner, San Diego.
 Dr. L. Lawrence Bosworth, San Diego.

Wadham & Kahle, attorneys, San Diego.
 Glen H. Munkelt, attorney, San Diego.

Notley S. Hammack, attorney, San Diego.
 Rev. Ralph Roder, "The American Center," San Diego.

Dr. G. G. Paull, San Diego.
 Dr. George W. Brace, San Diego.

Dr. J. H. Kerth, San Diego.
 A. B. Bowman, attorney, San Diego.

Dr. Homer C. Oatman, San Diego.
 Charles E. Burch, attorney, San Diego.

Dr. Charles F. Winbigler, minister, Central Baptist Church, Los Angeles.

Dr. Walter S. Kyes, San Diego.
 Edwin T. Lewis, rector of the St. Matthews Church, Whittier.

Lewis J. Utt, attorney, San Diego.
 Zacheus J. Meher, president, University of Santa Clara.

From bar associations and civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations, as follows:

Lions Club, Tulare, J. A. Sammon, president.
 R. L. Curran, commander Co. Council, American Legion, Bakersfield.

J. Stanley Fuller, commander Alta Post, No. 18, American Legion, Dinuba.

Valley Club of Pomona, Pomona.
 F. J. Eaton, Council No. 9875, Modern Woodmen of America, Los Angeles.

Schreiber Camp, No. 51, United Spanish War Veterans, L. T. Steen, commander, Pomona.

County Bar Association, Sherwood Green, president, Madera.
 Shrine Club of Marin County, Aug. C. Schlosser, secretary, San Rafael.

Zenith Woman's Club, Coalinga.
 Paso Robles Post, No. 50, American Legion, E. C. McAlear, commander, Paso Robles.

Madera Post, No. 11, American Legion, Madera.
 The American Legion, Coalinga.

E. R. Norby, adjutant, American Legion, Marysville.
 Post 948, Veterans Foreign Wars, Marysville.

Knights Ku-Klux Klan, Fresno.
 Ebell Club, E. Kate Rea, president, Anaheim.

R. L. Lane, president Brotherhood of American Yeomen, Los Angeles.
 B. R. Phillips, White Temple Men's Class, Anaheim.
 Oakdale Chamber of Commerce, Oakdale, R. L. Acker, secretary.
 Lions Club, Orange.
 Westside Improvement Association, Otto A. Kittans, treasurer, Los Angeles.
 The Boy Scouts, C. B. Mathews, secretary, Los Angeles.
 California Farmers' Union, Petaluma, R. V. Garrod, State president, Fred Millard, secretary.
 Sclots Hall Association, Vallejo, H. Taylor, secretary.
 Improved Order of Redmen, Famofet Tribe, Vallejo, E. Petit, chief of records.
 Vallejo Circle, No. 342, Neighbor of Woodcraft, Vallejo.
 Ioka Council, No. 30, D. of P., Vallejo.
 Kiwanis Club, F. D. MacGowan, jr., president, Vallejo.
 Exchange Club, Petaluma, Dr. H. H. Rodgers, president, Henry C. Gray, secretary.
 Live Oak Royal Neighbors of America, Albert Sauer, recorder Camp No. 3627, Chico.
 Fraternal Order of Eagles, San Pedro, Steve L. Monaghan, secretary.
 Neighbors of Woodcraft, Los Angeles.
 Tulare Cooperative Poultry Association, Tulare.
 Willow Camp, No. 163, Woodmen of the World, C. E. Pearson, C. C., Hanford.
 Anson G. Purchase, adjutant Oakland Post, No. 5, Oakland.
 La Mesa Post, No. 282, American Legion, La Mesa, Le Roy Bailey, adjutant.
 John Valentine Fleming Unit, No. 8, United Veterans of the Republic, Vallejo.
 The Fraternal Brotherhood, H. V. Davis, supreme secretary, Los Angeles.
 Fraternal Order of Eagles, No. 5, San Francisco, Gustave Pohlmann, secretary.
 Associated Charities of San Diego County, Alice S. Taber, registrar, San Diego.
 Los Angeles Firemen's Relief Association, E. H. Henry, recording secretary, Los Angeles.
 Major John R. Lynch Camp, No. 75, United Spanish War Veterans, I. N. Braan, adjutant, San Francisco.
 Knights of Pythias, Pacific Lodge, No. 203, Santa Monica, Frank J. Barton, K. of R. and S.
 Hillcrest Business Men's Association, C. E. Dewey, secretary, San Diego.
 San Diego Women's Civic Center, San Diego, Mrs. L. W. Harman, president; Mrs. M. Lamont, corresponding secretary.
 Santa Rosa Lodge, No. 53, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Santa Rosa.
 C. W. Gillett, secretary Tamalpais Camp, No. 427, Woodmen of the North, San Francisco.
 The Northern Federation of Civic Organizations, San Francisco, Frank Fischer, secretary.
 Knights of Columbus, Mission Council, No. 2519, E. S. Sheely, secretary, San Francisco.
 Native Sons of the Golden West, Tamalpais Parlor, No. 64, San Rafael.
 The Antlers' Club of Santa Rosa, F. P. Grace, jr., secretary, Santa Rosa.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Charlotte Frewell, secretary, Santa Barbara.
 The Lions Club, Riverside, J. S. Landbell, secretary.
 Glendale Lodge, No. 388, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Glendale.
 Loyal Order of Moose, San Francisco.
 Women's Public Welfare Commission, San Diego, Mrs. L. R. Middlebrook, secretary.
 The Mothers' Club of San Diego, Mrs. Frank W. Lane, secretary.
 The Church Federation of Sacramento, Sacramento, M. F. Harbaugh, secretary.
 Glendale Rotary Club, Glendale, Rene E. Olin, secretary.
 The District National Farm Loan Association, Dinuba.
 The David Scannell Club (Inc.), San Francisco, George F. Brown, president.
 The American Legion, Post No. 61, Sacramento.
 The Tuesday Afternoon Club, Glendale, Lily B. Richardson, secretary.
 Modern Woodmen of America, Chico, E. A. Opsal, clerk.
 The Lions Club, Chico, William G. West, secretary.
 Miantonomah Tribe, No. 9, Improved Order of Redmen, John P. Keenan, sachem, San Francisco.
 San Diego County Farm Bureau, J. G. France, county agricultural agent, San Diego.
 Glenn County Farm Bureau, Willows.
 Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 35, San Pedro.

From labor councils and unions:
 San Joaquin County Building Trades Council, Stockton.
 C. E. Rynearson, president Labor Council, Marysville.
 Central Trade Council of Labor, Fullerton.
 Central Labor Council of Petaluma, Petaluma; Al Hall, president; Thomas Fuller, secretary.
 San Francisco Labor Council; John A. O'Connell, secretary, San Francisco.
 George E. Bevan, assistant secretary Central Labor Council, Los Angeles.
 George McTague, secretary Building Trades Council, San Francisco.
 F. C. MacDonald, general president Building Trades Council (50,000 members), San Francisco.
 Roe H. Baker, president California State Federation of Labor (100,000 members), San Francisco.
 Allied Printing Trades Council, Los Angeles; Harvey E. Garman, secretary-treasurer.
 International Association of Machinists, Lodge No. 68; C. E. Blackman, president, San Francisco.
 Ice Wagon Drivers' and Helpers' Union, Local No. 519, San Francisco; H. Bohlmann, president.
 Sacramento Typographical Union, No. 46, Sacramento; H. G. Jackson, secretary.
 Operative Plasterers' and Cement Finishers' International Association, Local No. 341, Santa Barbara.
 Bricklayers' International Union No. 11, San Diego; Frank Bregmann, secretary-treasurer.
 International Alliance Theatrical Stage Employees; M. J. Sands, secretary, Los Angeles.
 Santa Barbara Local Union No. 1062, Santa Barbara; W. B. C. Callis, manager-secretary.
 Cigar Makers' Local Union, San Diego; Joseph Long, secretary.
 Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Los Angeles; N. M. Morgan, secretary.
 Cement Finishers' Local No. 627, Los Angeles; William Mullick, secretary.
 United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters; Frank J. Kennedy, assistant secretary, Santa Barbara.
 Brotherhood of Teamsters Local No. 85, San Francisco; John C. McLaughlin, secretary.
 Cooks, Pastry Cooks, and Assistants' Local No. 44, San Francisco.
 Longshore Lumbermen's Protective Association of the Port of San Francisco; H. H. Jensen, secretary, San Francisco.
 Moving Picture Operators' Local Union No. 297, San Diego; S. H. Metcalf, secretary.
 Order of Railway Conductors of America, Los Angeles; J. A. McNeill, general chairman.
 Glass Workers' Union, Local No. 636, Los Angeles; Harry Howarth, recording secretary.
 United Garment Workers of America, Los Angeles; L. C. Banduraga, secretary.
 United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Los Angeles; Thomas W. Blumm, president; C. E. Camp, secretary.
 San Diego Federated Trades and Labor Councils; E. H. Dowell, secretary, San Diego.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am advised that the following fraternal, civic, and labor organizations of Alameda County have adopted formal resolutions favoring an increase in salary for post-office employees:

Oakland Scottish Rite bodies.
 Soroptimist Club of Alameda County.
 Oakland Motor Car Dealers' Association.
 Downtown Property Owners' Association.
 Oakland Federation of Mothers' Clubs.
 The Electric Club of Oakland.
 The Oakland Exchange Club.
 California Retail Meat Dealers' Association.
 Pioneer Women of Oakland.
 Alameda County Building Trades Council.
 Lions Club of Oakland.
 Oakland Business and Professional Women's Club.
 San Leandro Chamber of Commerce.
 Col. J. J. Astor Auxiliary Veterans of Foreign Wars.
 Piedmont Avenue Merchants' Association.
 Women and Girl Workers of the Civil War.
 Lyon Relief Corps.
 Twenty-third Avenue Improvement Association.
 Central Labor Council of Alameda County.
 Liesure Post No. 999, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
 Oakland Lodge of Perfection.
 Oakland Parlor No. 50, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Piedmont Parlor No. 120, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Oakland Lodge No. 824, Loyal Order of Moose.
 Knights of Emania.

Evening Star Lodge No. 263, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Ancient and Mystic Order of Cabiri.
 Oakland Council No. 6, Y. M. I.
 Oakland Lodge No. 103, Knights of Pythias.
 Fruitvale Parlor No. 252, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Canton Oakland No. 11, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 East Bay Assembly No. 3, Past Presidents' Association, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Fruitvale Lodge No. 69, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Grove No. 145, U. A. O. D.
 Modern Woodmen of America, Camp No. 10915.
 Garfield Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Hawthorne Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Boot and Shoe Workers No. 324.
 Oakland Lodge No. 1070, Fraternal Brotherhood.
 Lathers' Union No. 88.
 Local No. 50, I. B. E. W.
 Sequoia Lodge No. 349, Free and Accepted Masons.
 Golden Rule Encampment No. 34.
 Bricklayers' Union No. 38.
 Court Advocate No. 7378, American Order of Foresters.
 Alma Circle No. 492, Neighbors of Woodcraft.
 Golden Gate Division No. 364, Order of Railway Conductors.
 Odin Lodge No. 1, Dania.
 Cooks and Waiters' Alliance No. 31.
 E. H. Liscum Camp No. 7, Spanish War Veterans.
 Melrose Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Cleveland Parent-Teachers' Association.
 McChesney Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Steam Fitters' Local No. 342, U. A.
 Division No. 283, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
 Tecumseh Tribe No. 62, Order of Red Men.
 Uncas Tribe No. 137, Order of Red Men.
 Federation of Post Office Clerks No. 78.
 Women's Benefit Association, Rosevale Review No. 16.
 Court Knarborough, American Order of Foresters.
 Bayside Parlor No. 204, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Cavour Nest, Order of Owls, No. 1758.
 Local No. 107, I. A. T. S. E.
 East Bay Auto Mechanics' Local No. 1546.
 Carpenters' Union No. 1667.
 Claremont Parlor No. 240, Native Sons of the Golden West.
 Court Shellmound No. 17, Foresters of America.
 Homestead No. 839, Brotherhood of American Yeomen.
 Hod Carriers and Cement Workers No. 166.
 Manzanita Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Rebekah Lodge, No. 11, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Piedmont Circle, No. 164, C. O. F.
 Golden Gate Assembly, No. 162, United Artisans.
 Oakland Schools Custodians' Association.
 Calanthe Temple, No. 6, Pythian Sisters.
 International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Oakland, No. 39.
 Elmhurst Junior High Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Material Teamsters' Union, Local No. 517.
 Lakeview Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Bella Vista Parent-Teachers' Association.
 R. C. I. P. A., Local No. 47.
 Oakland Council, No. 973, National Union Assurance Society.
 Court United States, No. 38, Foresters of America.
 Bahia Vista Parlor, No. 167, N. D. G. W.
 Danish Sisterhood, Denmark Lodge, No. 17.
 Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees.
 Journeymen Plumbers, Gas and Steam Fitters, No. 444.
 Lieut. Haskell F. Waterhouse Post, No. 819, Veterans Foreign Wars.
 Oakland Printing Pressmen, No. 215.
 Retail Shoe Salesmen's Association.
 Durant Mothers' Club.
 Fruitvale Chapter, No. 111, R. A. M.
 Butchers Union, Local No. 120.
 Local Union, No. 127, B. of P. D. and P. of A.
 Bakery Wagon Drivers and Salesmen's Union.
 Carpet Layers and Upholsterers' Local, No. 5.
 Milk Wagon Drivers' Local, No. 302.
 Oakland Lodge, No. 118, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Security Benefit Association, Kirkpatrick Council.
 Porter Lodge, No. 272, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Oakland Teachers' Association.
 Pacific Lodge, No. 39, Danish Brotherhood.
 Local Union No. 595, I. B. E. W.
 Fountain Lodge, No. 401, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.
 Athens Camp, No. 457, Woodmen of the World.
 Brooklyn Parlor, No. 151, N. S. G. W.
 Argonaut Review, No. 59, Women's Benefit Association.
 Acorn Lodge, No. 494, Free and Accepted Masons.
 Piedmont Avenue Parent-Teachers' Association.

Plasterers' Union No. 112.
 Elmerest Camp, No. 6430, R. N. of A.
 International Association of Machinists, No. 284.
 Melrose Heights Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Golden Gate Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Emeryville Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Piedmont Parlor, No. 87, N. D. G. W.
 Oakland Institute, No. 15, Y. L. I.
 Fruitvale Aerie, No. 1375, Fraternal Order of Eagles.
 Sons of Norway, Bjornestjerne Bjornson Lodge, No. 14.
 Central Division Lodge, No. 467, U. S. of M. of W. E. & R. S. L.
 Daniel Webster Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Rose Rebekah Lodge, No. 224.
 Franklin Parent-Teacher Association.
 Dorothea Dix Tent, No. 6.
 B. R. C. of A., No. 735.
 Frick Parent-Teachers' Association.
 City Foreman's Union, No. 55.
 Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 266.
 Street Car Employees of America.
 Clan Macdonald, No. 79, Order of Scottish Clans.
 Alden Grove, No. 216, U. A. O. D.
 Cabrillo Council, No. 614, Y. M. I.
 San Goltardo Circle, No. 242, Companions of Foresters.
 Estudillo Parlor, No. 223, N. S. G. W.
 Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen of America.
 Carpenters and Joiners' Local, No. 1187.
 Danish Relief Society of East Bay Cities.
 Hanna Institute, No. 68.
 Dania Kvindeforeningen, No. 2.
 Structural Iron Workers, No. 378.
 Marechal Lodge, No. 44, Knights of Pythias.
 Pride of the West Lodge, Knights of Pythias.
 Peralta Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Washington Parent-Teachers' Association.
 Col. John B. Wyman Circle, No. 22, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.
 Home Designers.
 Civic League of Improvement Associations.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I have also received many thousands of communications from manufacturers, wholesale jobbing houses, business concerns, and private citizens not directly interested as employees of the Government in this legislation, expressing their views and respectfully urging support and passage of this bill.

For the information of those Senators who now hear me I beg to add that from California I have received the mature opinion, coupled with requests to act accordingly, of some fifty-odd chambers of commerce, of many banks and trust companies, of many associations which are specially devoted to an economic administration of our Government, not only Federal but State, and of many societies and groups of reputable citizens of that State, all familiar with the purpose of this bill, all urging its passage.

I will trouble the Senate to read but one of the many respectful communications which have come to me from my State. It is but fair to add that many, if not the greater number, of these letters, petitions, and telegrams have come to me since the adjournment of the last session and since the position taken by the Senate as of that time.

I hold in my hand a telegram which reads as follows. I crave the attention of Senators to this particular telegram:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

December 4, 1924.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Believing as we do wholeheartedly in President Coolidge's policies in general and his program of retrenchment and economy in particular, we are, however, strongly of the opinion that in the specific instance of Senate bill 1898, having to do with the compensation of postal employees, who, according to our information, are inadequately paid, the Nation as a whole will best be served by passing the bill over the President's veto, and we earnestly recommend such action.

MERCHANTS & MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
 C. A. FULTZ, Manager.

I make an end by saying that I very fully, unreservedly, and unqualifiedly indorse the sentiments expressed by this great body of merchants and manufacturers of the great city of Los Angeles. So believing, laying aside all personality, utterly contemning any thought that anyone is actuated by improper motive or groveling ambition, I think, as that great statesman, Gladstone, thought, when, pleading the cause of Ireland, he said, "Justice delayed is justice denied."

I have indicated what I shall do. I add merely this: That if it be wise or thought to be necessary, let us proceed earnestly, candidly, to the passage of a measure which shall yield additional revenue to our Government. I do not commit myself to the exact terms of the bill which has been introduced for that purpose, but it is conceivable that that bill can be so amended and passed as to meet all demands and satisfy all persons, so that the end we all have in view will be achieved, namely, the granting of increased salaries, as to which all agree, and the raising of additional postal revenue, which many think is necessary.

MR. SMITH. Mr. President, the issues involved in the pending question are so clear that it is not necessary for me to attempt to add anything to what has been said. However, I feel it to be my duty to place in the permanent RECORD a statement of where I stand in reference to the measure which has passed the Senate and which has been vetoed by the President.

This body, a coordinate branch of the Government, with all the facts before it, toward the end of the last session almost unanimously agreed that the postal employees were not adequately paid, and therefore passed the bill which proposed to remedy that injustice. In view of that fact it is a matter of some surprise to me that within less than 12 months thereafter, by reason of the opinion of the Chief Executive that the economic condition of the country rendered it inadvisable to increase those salaries or to do justice to those employees whom the overwhelming majority of this body had decided were not adequately paid, many Senators should have entirely reversed their original position and have indicated their intention of sustaining the presidential veto of a measure which passed both Houses of Congress by so large a majority.

Mr. President, it is not a question of whether the Post Office Department is paying its way or not. It is a part of the function of the Government to see that our Postal Service meets the requirements of the public. The question involved here is not as to whether the operations of the Post Office Department are profitable or are not profitable. It is a question of rendering adequate service and adequately compensating those who render the service. If subsequently we shall believe that those who receive the service are not paying their adequate share for the particular service which they receive, and we shall desire to tax them for such extra service, then the Sterling bill will be in order; but there is no possible connection in principle between a bill designed to increase the revenue to meet the increase in salaries and the compensation of a public official who is rendering the service.

I maintain that the man who carries the mail to the most sparsely settled communities of our country, if he does his duty faithfully, is entitled to the same recognition in his compensation as is the man who distributes mail in our most congested centers of population.

I repeat, it is not a question of revenue; it is a question of service rendered. Do the postal employees render the service? We are all agreed and know that they do. Are they properly compensated? Ninety per cent of this body said they were not adequately compensated. Now, what has an increase in revenue got to do with the adequate compensation of the men? Do not let us put the cart before the horse and then go in the wrong direction. Let us pay these men wages to which they are justly entitled and to which we overwhelmingly said they were entitled.

The President says that the condition of the Federal Treasury is such that the country can not stand the additional expense, and therefore we must find revenue to meet this particular case. We did not consider when we originally passed this bill the question of raising additional revenue. At that time the question was merely whether or not these employees were properly compensated.

I wish to make one further observation, Mr. President. The inertia of habit is one of the forces that retard all progress. Perhaps it is a wise provision of nature that such a brake on our progress should be imposed; but we had as well recognize now as at any other time that the plane of living has so advanced that the luxuries of yesterday are the necessities of to-day. The cost of living has so greatly increased that the compensation has likewise got to be increased. There is not a Senator on this floor who believes that the men who serve us in the Postal Department are receiving an adequate return for the qualifications which they must possess and for the service which they must render.

I voted for the salary increase bill when it was before the Senate previously because I believed that there were not in all the Government service more efficient, honest, conscientious employees or public servants who were rendering a greater

service than the postal employees, and I believe that we ought unhesitatingly to grant this increase to them. Then, if we desire to raise additional revenue, let us search out those who are the beneficiaries to an extraordinary extent of the Postal Service, and, if we believe that there are certain periodicals carrying tremendous quantities of advertising matter which are receiving more out of it than they are putting in, let us correct that situation and determine whether or not those who are enjoying the benefits of the mail service are paying as they go. In other words, in place of reducing the salaries of the employees to meet the Budget let those who receive this special service pay for it.

In this connection let me say, Mr. President, that the real newspapers of the country are the greatest educational institution, bar none, in the world to-day. They give to the public information of current events and also the local news. It is perfectly natural that within certain zones the community spirit makes the local news of more importance, and, therefore, under a law passed a few years ago, we provided certain zones and gave to the people within those zones the cheaper rates to encourage the dissemination of local news, general community information, each morning in order to let the neighbors know what matters of importance had occurred within their territory. As the zones increased the distance we increased the rates. It is proposed under this bill to penalize the very thing for which the mail service was established, namely, the dissemination of community news. I stand unalterably opposed to any increase in the rates on our news service that will in the least cripple the usefulness of that service.

There are certain publications that carry fiction, that carry academic discussions of questions, that do not interest the public within a certain zone; but our newspapers do. I want to know what has occurred in my State and in the immediately adjoining States. Therefore I want the newspapers encouraged to give the best service they can, and make it as cheap as possible, so that the poorest may be the beneficiaries of that service. Instead of increasing the rates upon genuine news within the community zone we ought to decrease them and put the penalty upon those who make money out of the mail service rather than out of those who get the benefit of the news.

You are not deceiving the public. They know, as well as we in this Chamber know, that this bill is brought in here as a nail to hang a coat on, as an excuse for facing about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

MR. STERLING. Mr. President, the whole theory of the veto message of the President is based on the proposition that the postal salary bill was not justified under the plea of urgent necessity and that unless there was that urgent necessity the President would not be warranted in giving his approval to a bill that meant a general tax upon the people of the United States of \$68,000,000. I want to call the attention of Senators to a few of the facts upon which the President based that message, and I hope we may be just a little bit practical now in the consideration of this important question.

The President calls attention to some of the salaries paid postal employees, after having mentioned the several increases given those salaries within a period of three years. He states what the average salaries are for the different classes of employees in the year 1923. He says:

As a result of these readjustments the average salaries for 1923 are—

Post-office clerks, \$1,751, increase of \$919 since 1909, or 110 per cent.

Speaking of the higher cost of living, Mr. President, there is a salary increase for the post-office clerks that runs beyond the increased cost of living.

Post-office carriers, \$1,752.83, increase of \$862 since 1907, or 96 per cent.

Again, Mr. President, an increase of salaries running ahead of the increased cost of living during that period of time.

Railway postal clerks, \$2,107, increase of \$946 since 1907, or 81 per cent.

I venture to say that that is beyond and out of proportion to the higher cost of living.

Railway postal clerks, including travel allowance, \$2,292, increase of \$1,131 since 1907, or 97 per cent.

Again an increase for these employees beyond the increased cost of living.

Rural carriers, \$1,849.52, increase of \$1,140 since 1907, or 160 per cent.

I venture to say that that not only fairly includes the higher cost of living and compensation therefor but compensation for the necessary equipment of the rural carriers.

Then the President makes a comparison of the salaries of the post-office clerks with the salaries of other employees of the Government, the clerks, administrative and clerical, in the various departments:

The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from \$1,140 to \$2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately \$1,554 on July 1, 1924.

So, Mr. President, there is the basis for the President's statement that under the conditions as they exist there was no warrant for appropriating \$68,000,000 to be raised by general taxation to pay the increased salaries proposed in the bill; but the President implies that provision might be made for the increase of the salaries, and, what is more appropriate, statements to the contrary notwithstanding, that in the very bill in which we provide for an increase of salaries we should provide a reasonable adjustment of postal rates so as to meet those salaries.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is nothing more than just and reasonable that there should be some readjustment of postal rates. We can make a readjustment, a sensible and a reasonable one, without working any great or peculiar hardship upon any branch of the Postal Service, from first-class mail down to and including fourth-class or parcel-post mail. That is what the committee have sought to do.

It may be, Mr. President, that in the short time allotted to the committee there was not the opportunity to go into all details as carefully as we would like to have done; but with the data we have before us in the shape of the cost-ascertainment report, in the shape of the bill itself, in the shape of the hearings before the committee, and in the face of the discussion already had here on the floor of the Senate when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] introduced the bill and made his remarks thereon—with all these data and with all this as our groundwork, I submit that we can work out here, during the remainder of this session, a fair, reasonable, and just bill.

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to allude to expressions that were made early to-day, here on the floor of the Senate, to the effect that there was no intent to pass the so-called Sterling bill; that the bill was introduced as a camouflage, and for the purpose of affecting the votes of Senators.

Mr. President, nothing is farther from the truth. This bill was introduced in good faith, with the honest intention of working without ceasing for the purpose of enacting this bill into law; and I am surprised at the lack of courage shown by Senators when they say that it has not the ghost of a chance, and that there will be a failure to enact any legislation. With the consideration given, with the background as we have it, with this basis for legislation as we have it, why should there be a failure to enact the proposed legislation?

Mr. President, it is the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to work for the passage of this legislation in the event that the President's veto is sustained, as I believe it will be sustained. Will you join me, you who are so concerned about overriding this veto now? Remember the injunction of Cardinal Wolsey, who said:

O Cromwell, Cromwell!

Had I but served my God with half the zeal

I served my king, he would not in mine age

Have left me naked to mine enemies.

Oh, fellow Senators, if you now will, with half the zeal you have shown in trying to override the President's veto, join with me in an honest effort to pass this bill, it will be accomplished, and we will have done a great piece of work, one which will satisfy the postal employees throughout, one which will make a fair and reasonable adjustment of rates and be satisfactory to the users of the mails and to the general public.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I discover so little interest on the part of Senators at this late hour that I hesitate to impose upon their patience; and yet I think the question which we have to pass upon now within a little over an hour is a very important one—important not only on account of the immediate interest of the postal employees but important in its bearing on the future policy of this Government.

I am deeply interested in seeing that justice is done to the postal employees, but I am equally as deeply if not more deeply interested in seeing that a precedent which I think is

illogical and which I think will lead to bad consequences shall not be established as a result of our action to-day.

Apparently there is general agreement among Senators that the postal employees are entitled to the increases accorded them in the pending bill. The Senate in its former action upon this question was practically unanimous. Only one or two Senators in the prolonged discussion have criticized or questioned the justice of the proposed increases. It is true that the President in his veto message expressed doubt of the justice of these increases; but it is understood that the President has modified his former position and now concurs in the increases adopted by the Congress. So that all question as to the right of the postal employees to increased pay and the fairness of the amount provided in the bill may be taken as removed and calls for no further discussion.

The question which divides the Senate at the present time is, therefore, not as to whether the postal employees are entitled to increased pay, but as to whether we shall give them these increases by sustaining against the veto the legislation heretofore passed by an overwhelming majority of the Congress or, if ever, through a new bill, which is now presented by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to meet the objection made by the President of the United States on account of the failure of Congress to provide a specific fund to cover these salary increases. Mr. President, if we shall sustain the veto of the President, the substitute bill reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in order to meet this requirement imposed by the President, as a condition precedent to his signature, I venture the prediction will never become a law and that the 300,000 faithful post-office employees asking and entitled to the benefit of this legislation will either be indefinitely delayed in their just demand or will not get it at all.

I apprehend that by reason of the objectionable rate provisions of the substitute bill reported by the committee and so strenuously sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota, that measure stands slight chance of passage either through the Senate or the House. Those provisions are more or less a radical readjustment of the postal rates structure. It has been admitted here in the discussions by at least two Senators on the subcommittee that reported this new rate schedule that the investigation and hearings preliminary to their action was hurried and unsatisfactory, and the chairman of that subcommittee admitted upon the floor of the Senate, that his committee had disregarded many of the findings of the "cost ascertainment" committee appointed by the Post Office Department to aid the committee in work of reconstructing the postal rate structure; not only that, but he admitted that the testimony taken was so unsatisfactory and so conflicting that they had no been able to reconcile it, and that it had been, in many instances and particulars, disregarded and his committee in fixing the rates had, in probably most instances, acted upon its own estimates and conclusions as to what were the facts in the case.

Is it wise to make such fundamental changes as the substitute bill provides in the postal rate structure upon a short, admittedly unsatisfactory investigation, at the risk of doing rank injustice to the millions of patrons of that great service? A wrong, possibly, to the patrons of this great department of the Government as great as we would do to the postal employees by denying them the increases to which they are so justly entitled?

I have here a letter from the publisher of one of the leading newspapers in my State, a paper of State-wide circulation, but a paper whose circulation is confined possibly chiefly to the first zone, in which he advises me that the increases proposed on second-class matter will add \$33,000 a year to the cost of distributing his newspaper, and that that \$33,000 would be more than twice the amount of the profits he is now making.

If the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads had found, as a matter of fact, that justice required, that the public interest required, that there should be a revision of postal rates, that would be well and good; but did anybody propose, before the suggestion of the President, to make any change in the postal rates? Was anybody complaining that the postal rates were unfair and unjust? Have we any evidence now that the postal rates are unfair and unjust, and shall we, without a complaint against those rates, without a previous suggestion that they were wrong or unjust or unequal, do the wrong of increasing the burdens on those who have to pay those rates simply because a sense of justice impels us to increase the wages of underpaid employees of the Post Office Department?

The whole proposition and suggestion of levying a special tax to meet a necessary departmental expenditure required in

the ordinary conduct of a branch of the Government service is illogical and unsound. When we had before us the proposition to pay the soldiers of the late war a bonus we were told that we could not do it unless we provided the money by some special tax or device. That was a new departure and is the only precedent for the course now insisted upon in the matter of increase in postal salaries. The old theory was that if it was just and expedient that the Government should do a given thing it should be done and that the cost should be paid out of the general fund in the Treasury or allotted to the particular department concerned.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not care to be interrupted, because I have hardly time to finish what I have in mind.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am glad that is the reason.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would be glad to be interrupted, but for that.

This is the first time the suggestion has ever been made here that we could not do justice without levying a special tax upon the people to enable us to do it—could not do justice because temporarily the Treasury Department was in difficulties; that we could not pass legislation to discharge a governmental obligation, however unjust or just, unless specific provision was made to raise the money to pay it.

We did not follow that course when we established the Rural Free Delivery Service. Years ago it was thought that it would be of great public value to establish such a service. Everybody conceded that the cost would be great. Everybody knew that the receipts from the new service would be negligible. Did anybody stop to say that we could not afford to establish such necessary service because the Post Office receipts did not justify it? Certainly not.

A little bit later an agitation arose in favor of the Parcel Post Service. Everybody recognized that that would be a great boon to the country, especially to the farmers in the rural districts of the country; but it was said that the expense would be enormous, that the revenues of the Post Office Department were absolutely unequal to it. Nobody suggested then that we establish the service and increase postal rates to an extent that would cover the cost of the new service. The theory was that the service was needed. The post office was never intended to be a money-making institution. The post office is a function of government, instituted and organized for the purpose of serving a great public policy. Whether it pays its way or not, we must have that branch of the service abreast with the requirements of the hour. So we inaugurated the parcel post, involving enormous expenditures, without making any provision to increase the rates of the Postal Service to such an extent that they would meet the additional cost.

Mr. President, now we find that there are 300,000 Government employees in the Postal Service who are grossly underpaid, who are not paid enough to adequately support themselves and their families. Everybody concedes the justice of their demand for a fair wage, but they are put off because the department they serve is not making enough money to pay its way, although the National Treasury has more money than its needs require. That might do for an excuse if the Treasury were bankrupt.

But the Treasury is not bankrupt. I have here in my hand a report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that report shows that last June there was a surplus in the Treasury of \$505,000,000. The last statement made by the Treasury Department shows that there is now in the Treasury a surplus of over \$300,000,000. When we had a surplus of \$300,000,000 once before the President and his Secretary of the Treasury recommended to Congress that we get rid of that surplus by reducing taxes, chiefly on incomes and profits. Now we have in the Treasury as much surplus money as we had when that recommendation was made, and yet we are told that in the interest of economy we can not take money out of the Treasury and pay these salaries, but that we must levy a special tax on the patrons of the Postal Service.

The President of the United States is deceiving himself when he supposes that the Government can get the money to pay these increases in postal wages without taxing the American people. The substitute for the vetoed bill is a tax bill; it imposes burdensome taxes upon many and additional taxes on the masses who use the Postal Service.

It is not to be called a tax; it is called an increase in postal rates, but you can not increase postal rates in this country without taxing the people. Raise the rates upon the newspaper advertising of this country 1 cent a pound, and do you suppose the newspaper publisher is going to pay that? Certainly, in the first instance; but as surely as the night follows the day

he will add that expenditure as a part of his cost in the price of his advertising matter.

Raise the rates by imposing an additional tax upon parcel post, 2 cents additional on every package of parcel post, a service that we have heretofore taken great pride in because it was a cheap service, because it was admirably fitted to the needs and requirements of oppressed agriculture and the oppressed masses of the country? Add 2 cents on every package and who will pay it? Will not the consumers of the country pay it? Will not the great masses of the people of the country pay it? Is that not as much a tax upon the people as any tax imposed in the 1924 revenue bill?

Every increase that is imposed in this substitute for the vetoed bill is upon the line of the taxes imposed in the present internal revenue act, and of the same character except as to income and excess-profits taxes. Why impose these new taxes when there is plenty of money in the Treasury wrung from the people by taxation, levied for the purpose of paying the expenses of the Government, including those of the Post Office Department?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment. I desire to speak briefly upon a very interesting subject—"Before and after election." I am surprised and in a way amused at the turn things have taken in this Chamber since the vote on this bill just a few months ago. On yesterday afternoon when an effort was made to kill this legislation several Senators who voted to consign it to its last resting place had supported this bill last year before the election. They rushed in voluntarily before the subcommittee over which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] presided and begged to be given time enough to declare their enthusiastic support of the measure. They said they merely wanted to say a word in behalf of these underpaid and hard-worked postal employees. They wanted the record to show that they were heartily in favor of the increase in salary. They stated that these men were entitled to the increase, that they were poorly paid, that they were rendering faithful service to the Government and to the people of the country, and they wanted the fact that they had been there to go out to the postal employees so that they might know that their Senator friends were here on the job trying to obtain justice and a fair deal for them.

But, Mr. President, that was last year. That was before the battle of ballots. That was before some of the Senators received new commissions in November to occupy seats here for six years more. It makes a good deal of difference with some Senators whether the matter in question is up for consideration just before election or just after election. Some Senators will vote one way before election and then vote quite another way after election. I like to see Senators consistent. I like to see them vote just after the election as they voted just before the election. When they do that I am constrained to believe that they are voting their convictions and that they are trying to do what is right.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] was unfortunate in quoting Wolsey, who said to Cromwell:

O Cromwell, Cromwell!

Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my king, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies.

Mr. President, the effort to serve the king here is what caused the change in the vote before the election and after the election. Last year Senators were looking out for themselves. They were seeking to serve their country. They were trying to do justice by the postal employees. But the election is over and now they come to serve the king, he who holds the appointing power. There is a lake full of lame ducks swimming around, hobbling about the Capitol, and they are looking wistfully toward the White House.

Mr. ASHURST. And, Mr. President, many, if not most of the lame ducks, are performing a strange miracle—singing swan songs.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes. But, Mr. President, since the election and during this session the Senator from South Dakota has changed his position and made several speeches against the position he took last year. I believe I can see dangling before his eyes a fine and luscious plum in the way of an appointment to some fat Federal office and sometimes I can see him look-

ing up anxiously at it and tiptoeing as he stretches forth his hands as if eager to take it in his grasp.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I wish I had the imagination even of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think the Senator would much prefer to have the appointment. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The Chair must admonish the occupants of the galleries that manifestations of applause are not permitted under the rules of the Senate, and a repetition of the offense might involve an order to clear the galleries.

Mr. STERLING. I merely wish to say in regard to the appointment that I can not even indulge in any imaginings.

Mr. HEFLIN. But I observe that the Senator refrains from saying he would not accept an appointment.

Mr. President, I have before me the Record which tells the tale as to how Senators voted on this question before the election, and it is a fortunate thing for the people of the country that we have a Record in which to note the speeches and votes of Senators. If they should for any reason forget their own records, we have a means by which we can remind them and the people, as we do to-day, of the truth as it is written. On the passage of the bill last year, before Senators had submitted their cause to the people, and while the voters had a chance, with their ballots in their hands, to return them or retire them, the vote on this measure here stood 73 in favor of the passage of the bill and 3 against its passage. Just think of that, Senators—73 for and only 3 against—all just before the election. What has become of these dear and beloved Senators who voted before the election to increase the postal employees' salaries as they ought to be increased? Where are they now? Many of them are swimming in the lame-duck mill pond and are looking anxiously and imploringly, and some disgustingly, toward the White House, crooning softly the name of "Coolidge, Coolidge."

In the revelations and promises that loom in the aftermath of the election they have somehow forgotten the postal employees and their just claim for better pay and are seeking now with all the power they possess to defeat this bill. It will be defeated, if it is defeated at all, by lame-duck votes. I mean those votes will decide it, because the vote is going to be exceedingly close. But the others who have deserted that column in the Record in which their votes last year were recorded—where 73 enthusiastic, warm-hearted, determined friends of the postal employees are recorded—have slid out and they should be remembered by the people everywhere who believe in fairness to those faithful servants of our Government who are so hard worked and underpaid.

They come in with this other makeshift bill providing that we must increase postage on newspapers and other mail matter in an effort to sidetrack this bill and kill the parcel post law. They know the Senate is not going to go into the postal rate increasing business on the short notice we have had and the very inadequate investigation that has been made. They know that. It is an effort to present this as something soft, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] said, to light on—after jumping over the record containing the votes cast for this measure just a few months ago before the election. I am not in favor of this uncalled-for and wholesale raising of postal rates, but I am in favor of voting to pass the bill over the President's veto because I believe it is right, because I believe it is just, and because I believe that the Government that is able to take a battleship which cost \$35,000,000 and shoot it to pieces to make a holiday for target practice is able to do justice by the postal employees of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I believe it is generally conceded that all honest-minded people believe that men and women who do honest work should have an honest living wage. Many postal employees are not getting an honest living wage at the present time. It is conceded, too, that the bill for the increase of postal salaries is fair and just. If there was reason for the bill seven months ago, there is more reason for it now. According to the best statistics we can get the cost of living has gone up, and they need the increase. They need it now. This talk about raising postage rates to take care of the increase is camouflage. The general policy of the Government is to figure the expense and then raise the revenue to meet it. Either the postal boys are entitled to the increase or they are not entitled to it. If they are entitled to it, let us give it to them.

Of course, I am included as one of the expelled four to whom the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] re-

ferred yesterday, and perhaps I should not say anything to-day; perhaps I should be over in the middle aisle, on neutral ground, to do what little talking I have to do. It did not hurt my feelings in the least to be barred from the sacred caucus of the Grand Old Party, but when I was omitted from the very fine breakfast over at the broad table at the White House it did hurt my feelings a little. I want to remind the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] that there were four of us at least on this side of the Chamber who did miss an excellent breakfast, with fine pancakes made of buckwheat from Ohio and smothered in maple sirup from Vermont, and real farm sausage from Maryland, or perhaps from the Chicago packing companies; I do not know which. A few things of that kind we did miss. Perhaps, after all, it pays to be regular.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Senators may get here before the vote is taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	King	Reed, Pa.
Ball	Fernald	Ladd	Robinson
Bayard	Ferris	La Follette	Sheppard
Borah	Fess	McCormick	Shipstead
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKellar	Shorridge
Broussard	Frazier	McKinley	Simmons
Bruce	George	McLean	Smith
Bursum	Gerry	McNary	Smoot
Butler	Glass	Mayfield	Stanfield
Cameron	Gooding	Means	Stanley
Capper	Greene	Metcalf	Sterling
Caraway	Hale	Moses	Swanson
Copeland	Harrell	Neely	Trammell
Couzens	Harris	Norbeck	Underwood
Cummins	Harrison	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Heflin	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Warren
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phlipps	Watson
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Weller
Edwards	Kendrick	Ralston	Willis
Elkins	Keyes	Ransdell	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to the roll call, there is a quorum present.

The Chair will state the question. It is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Upon that question the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRUCE (when his name was called). Together with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON] I am paired on this question with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. If the Senator from Missouri were here, he would vote "nay," and if I were privileged to vote, I would vote "yea," as would also the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON].

Mr. KING (when his name was called). Upon this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON]. If those Senators were present, each of them, I am advised, would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. RALSTON (when his name was called). On this question, as stated by the Senator from Maryland, I am paired, in conjunction with the Senator from Maryland, with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. If that Senator were present, he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea." In his absence, I withhold my vote.

I wish the RECORD to show unmistakably what my attitude is on this question. I want to protect the absent Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], who is away on account of the sickness of his wife. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], as well as the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], are all absent. They are paired on the question of voting to override the President's veto. If the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] were present, they would vote to override the President's veto, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. ELKINS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], but I understand on this question a general pair does not hold. Therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 55, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—55

Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McKellar	Shipstead
Brookhart	Gerry	McLean	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Caraway	Gooding	Mayfield	Smith
Copeland	Harris	Means	Stanfield
Conzens	Harrison	Moses	Stanley
Dale	Heflin	Neely	Swanson
Dill	Howell	Norris	Trammell
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Underwood
Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Wadsworth
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Ferris	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Ladd	Robinson	

NAYS—29

Ball	Dial	McCormick	Sterling
Borah	Ernst	McKinley	Warren
Bursum	Fernald	Metcalf	Watson
Butler	Fess	Norbeck	Weller
Cameron	Greene	Oddie	Willis
Capper	Hale	Pepper	
Cummins	Harrell	Phipps	
Curtis	Keyes	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—11

Bruce	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Stephens
Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Shields	Wheeler
King	Ralston	Spencer	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 55, the nays are 29. The bill having failed to receive the majority required by the Constitution, does not pass.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business will be automatically laid before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is all I desired. I did not desire to interrupt the Senator from Oregon, except to have the unfinished business laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam-power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration House bill 10404, being the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senate heard the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ASHURST. What is it, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a request that the Senate take up for consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. BRUCE. I object.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Maryland objects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood that there was objection. I had risen to ask that the unfinished business might be temporarily laid aside before the Agricultural bill was taken up; but as there is objection it is not necessary for me to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

COMMENTS ON ACTION OF REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, I desire at this time to speak at some length on the recent Republican caucus and its results; and I ask that I be not interrupted until I have finished my remarks.

ARE THESE THE REAL REPUBLICANS?

Mr. President, the 28th day of November, 1924, will probably go down in the annals of our country as the day on which occurred one of the most singular, far-reaching, and important events in our political history. It will be embellished with dramatic scenery. Great names will emblazon the pages of the story, and time—the just arbiter of all events—will award to some of those names the appellation of greatness;

to some, political chicanery; to some, wisdom and great intellect; but, I fear, to the majority interested, pure and simple knavery.

I can not but have sad reflections when I think upon some of my colleagues with whom I have served in this distinguished and august body and parts of their record that must follow them through the course of history, that is, those who shall prove of sufficient consequence to be awarded a place in history.

The great pity, Mr. President, is that so many men, when they face momentous occasions in their lives, do not have the perspective to see the consequences of their action, and apparently do not have the ability and understanding to realize its present significance.

The principal reason why the 28th day of November, 1924, will be a red mark in the American political calendar will be because of the fact that certain Republican Senators of this Congress met in duly authorized caucus in the majority caucus room at the hour of eleven, when the morning sun was blazing forth in all of its glory, and in the midst of their deliberations the following resolution was presented by Senator REED of Pennsylvania, and adopted by a viva voce vote:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the conference that Senators LA FOLLETTE, LADD, BROOKHART, and FRAZIER be not invited to future Republican conferences, and be not named to fill any Republican vacancies in the Senate committees.

It was not only my singular honor to receive a formal notice of this conference, but the genial, pleasing, and lovable Republican leader of the Senate did me the further honor of calling me over the phone notifying me of the proposed conference with the request that I be present.

Mr. President, I accepted the invitation and am glad to say that I was present to see the curtains raised and lowered on this memorable occasion.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

History relates, Mr. President, that in the French penal colony on Devils Island the mode of execution was by the guillotine. There was a convict serving time on that island who, while a prisoner, was also the official executioner. He put to death a great many men, calmly and apparently with great satisfaction with his ability to do the job neatly and quickly. In fact, he took a great deal of pride in his instrument of death. While a prisoner he committed a further crime for which he was sentenced to the guillotine, and his request was, when he was being led to the block, that he be allowed to pull the cord that released the blade to cut off his own head, because he felt satisfied that he would so adjust the machinery and set it in motion as to do the job neatly and quickly.

I am not so sure, Mr. President, but that some of the sponsors for the resolution adopted in this historic conference of November 28 had somewhat the same idea in mind when they proposed its adoption. It is quite evident that it was intended that somebody's head should be chopped off, and I am of the firm conviction that the four Senators mentioned are still very much alive.

It is not a rash prediction to prophesy that popular opinion will soon see some of the rest in their death agonies, politically speaking.

It is quite significant, Mr. President, that certain Members of this body seem to take the results of the recent election as a special dispensation of power to them to do as they please. Perhaps they had a right to obey the master that brayed and prayed. They have, as a result of the election, arrogated unto themselves all of the emoluments, authority, and dictum of the National Republican Party, and it is interesting to note that among those who sat in this historic conference was the distinguished and dignified junior Senator, the present chairman of the Republican National Committee. On that occasion one must imagine that he had been duly commissioned and endowed with a special authority to act for the Republican Party. One would be almost induced to believe, Mr. President, were we not so familiar with the political history of some of our contemporaries, that new blood had been injected into the Republican Party and into the councils of the Republican senatorial caucus and that that new blood was determined to take the "bull by the horns" and force some of the more cautious and experienced party workers into precipitate action.

WALL STREET HEARD FROM

The Wall Street Journal, Saturday, December 6, 1924, has this to say:

Mr. President, I ask leave to print this editorial without reading. I do not want to take the time necessary to read the articles that I shall comment upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The prime significance of the recent action of the Senate Republicans in ousting Senators LADD, FRAZIER, BROOKHART, and LA FOLLETTE from the ranks of the Republican majority is readily apparent. It means that the Senate Republicans are going to stand up and fight. There is another aspect of that situation which means much.

Senators REED, of Pennsylvania, ERNST, of Kentucky, and EDGE, of New Jersey, were the three who inaugurated the move and pushed it through. Unless many good signs fall that marks the beginning of a surge of new blood in the real leadership of the Senate.

It is doubtful if the Senate Republicans would have taken the action they did a month or two weeks prior to the day they did take it. But when the REED resolution was presented there was only scattered opposition. The very good reason for this was that Republican papers throughout the country were demanding the action. In addition Republican voters let their Senators hear from them in no unmistakable fashion.

Meanwhile President Coolidge is praised in some quarters and blamed in others for the action of the Senate conference. Both praise and blame in this case are undeserved, for the best of information is that the President had no hand in the proceedings directly.

THE INDEPENDENT EDITORIAL

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, in the New York Independent, for December 13, 1924, there appeared an editorial entitled "Policies versus personalities," which I ask to have included as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

POLICIES VERSUS PERSONALITIES

To the victors belong the committee chairmanships. It was inevitable that Senators LA FOLLETTE, BROOKHART, LADD, and FRAZIER, having supported the third-party movement, should be disciplined, in so far as their Republican colleagues in the upper House can. No political organization that refuses to purge itself of unrepentant rebels after insurrections deserves to survive or will survive long. If the Republican leaders had failed to take action against the La Follette bloc, their quiescence would have encouraged other schisms.

However, merely tossing these Senators from the Northwest out of their chairmanships solves no major problem. The four under discipline went to the Senate as Republicans nominated under the primary system. In the last election the Republicans ran no one against BROOKHART. A Republican majority in the Senate may say this man or that is not Republican; but if his constituents in the Northwest go on nominating and electing him as a Republican indefinitely, what then? Purging a party is a complicated business under the primary laws.

In order to make effective the banishment of Senators LA FOLLETTE, BROOKHART, LADD, and FRAZIER the Republican Party will have to take the case to their constituents. If this is to be a fight to a finish, the regulars must battle the insurgents on the home grounds. They will have to encourage rising men there to contest the present insurgent leaders for party mastery, and they will have to furnish the champions of party regularity with a legislative record appealing to the voters. In other words, this Republican Congress must make good on an agrarian program. There is a good deal of economic sense in the Republican Party hitherto used chiefly to the benefit of cities; let it turn that sense soberly to increasing rural prosperity, a process which, in our opinion, will be largely in the direction of improved arrangements for financing farm operations and marketing farm products.

Otherwise the Republicans risk losing the Northwest and of seeing created there an opposition enclave as solid as the solid South. The Northwest—from the Rockies to Lake Michigan, and from the Canadian border to Kansas—is unified geographically and economically, and recent adversity has stiffened resentment against the industrial East. The Republicans should see in their present triumph an opportunity to check this antagonism instead of a mandate to leave things alone. Failure to do so may work out in the fullness of time in a solid Northwest, dominated by an agrarian party everlastingly at odds with the money-lending, manufacturing East. That outcome would be a distinct step in political decadence. The chief hope of sane and vital political progress lies in dissolving the solid South and keeping other sections of the country from congealing in the meantime. The President, with his usual shrewdness, inclines toward conciliation. He perceives the folly of adding insult to discipline, and he wants harmony in 1926. But his best insurance of that is not in concession to personalities but in proving to the agricultural community that the Republican Party has rural economy definitely on its conscience.

Mr. LADD. In this connection I call attention to the fact that if the Old Guard type of Republicans are to contest and win the election "they will have to furnish the champions of party regularity with a legislative record appealing to the voters. In other words, the Republican Congress must make good on an agrarian program." I commend this to the painstaking consideration of the steering committee.

Again I refer to the caucus that other statement, "The Republicans should see in their present triumph an opportunity to check antagonism instead of to leave things alone." The editorial points out that the President "wants harmony in 1926." Will they take the lead in inaugurating and putting through legislation for "marketing farm products" so as to raise the farmer's dollar from 60 cents to par with the manufacturer's dollar, which will then only be 50 per cent of the banker's credit dollar, and so bring peace and a fair increase to the farmers of the Northwest? Perhaps the wisdom of experience in the ripeness and fullness of time will teach some men a few things.

Mr. President, I believe that I was the only one of the four Senators who were singled out for this rigid and autocratic discipline in the resolution as subject to exclusion who was present or who heard that resolution presented and discussed by the members of the caucus.

I will always remember with a great deal of pleasure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who, with finality of authority and in confidence of well-calculated and well-groomed superiority, paved the way for this resolution by first presenting the matter to the attention of the conference.

PENNSYLVANIA SPEAKS

Neither can I forget the concern expressed by the Senators from Pennsylvania or the personal consequences to themselves should the caucus fail to take such action before they return to their State. Judging from their actions and sentiments expressed, they feared the wrath of the large contributors to the national campaign from the State of Pennsylvania.

To be fair, Mr. President, we must judge men in the light of the environment and of the times in which they live. In order to understand the true political background of the Senators and the motives which actuated them we must have some authentic authority for our information. In this connection I wish at this time to read from a speech of John Wanamaker, which appears in the work entitled "Speeches of John Wanamaker on Boss Domination in Pennsylvania Politics," pages 123 and 124. This is the testimony of an unexceptional witness who knew the inside working of the Republican machine of Pennsylvania. The tenor of his evidence is as follows.

I ask that this article be printed as a part of my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARAWAY in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BOSS DOMINATION

No sooner does a man show independence and refuse to indorse the misdeeds of the political machine than he is taken in hand to be disciplined. If he is the employee of a corporation, he is threatened with discharge; if he is a merchant, he is boycotted; if he is a clerk, the head of the firm is notified that he must be suppressed; if he is interested in a corporation, the company's interests are threatened; if he is a director or stockholder in a bank, large customers are found to threaten the withdrawal of their business; if he is a physician, good patrons object; if he is a lawyer, his clients are given orders and threaten to leave him; if he is a preacher, members of his congregation protest; if a man daring to be independent of political dictation is in debt, he is threatened by those who hold his obligations. This is not the result of accident, but of method. It is the result of a carefully planned and manipulated system that extends into every county in the State and reaches all classes of business. It is every-day and every-year working machinery, manned by a host of political retainers, who report to the central office the first symptoms of machine insubordination, and who are expected to advise ways and means of applying the silencing and crushing pressure. But there is a class of men beyond these influences which the machine must reach. They are the men who have to their credit long years of honorable professional and business records; men who are leaders in their respective communities; men whose very names are synonyms for integrity and character; men whom ordinary considerations will not move. These men are a constant menace to the existence of the machine, and methods must be found to keep them from taking an active interest in politics. To influence these men is set in motion the character torpedo, the reputation-smirching and the good-name-destroying machine. It is worked by the

hands of a gang of place holders and place seekers, who risk nothing by trying to rob honest men of their characters. It is a warning of what all who protest must encounter. The blackmailer begins to operate. That most contemptible of human beings—the anonymous letter writer—starts his miserable work.

The scandal peddler, a moral outcast, labors systematically to poison society with innuendo, insinuations, and base lies. Detective agencies, composed of low tools and thugs, are hired at great expense to dog the footsteps of those who dare work against the machine. They are paid to fabricate stories, invent false accusations, and furnish false evidence against anyone whom the machine may wish to destroy. Any man who causes trouble is sure to feel their vengeance. Those connected in any way with the persons of their special hatred are not safe. The youth or the aged are not spared. They do not care for the gray-haired mother or innocent children, and this is why men do not dare to fight. Any man who enters the arena of Pennsylvania politics to-day against the machine will not escape it.

THE CAUCUS SPECTACLE

Mr. LADD. There were those present at the caucus who evidently felt that they were witnessing a great drama. There were those who saw in it the possibilities of a rip-roaring comedy. There were others who expressed the blankness of those who were attending a great mystery play, the solution of which would not be given until just before the lowering of the final curtain, and may I suggest, Mr. President, that the final curtain on the final scene of this spectacular production has not yet been lowered. We are yet to hear the applause or the hisses of the public audience.

Although I am not at all disturbed as to the aftermath of the caucus either personally or politically, in so far as it can possibly affect myself, I am moved to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate because I consider the action taken by the caucus as vastly more meaningful for the country as a whole and for the future of the Republican Party than it can possibly be for any Member of the Senate.

The resolution and its adoption must be considered as a notice to the country of the purposes of those Senators who have assumed the power and responsibility of determining the future policy of the Republican Party for an indefinite period in the future.

The resolution adopted by the caucus is predicated upon the course of action followed by the Senators it was proposed to reprimand during the political campaign just closed. The caucus by its action presumes to sit in judgment on the regularity or party loyalty of the Senators named—on their fitness for membership in the Republican Party, which they are held to have abandoned and betrayed by desertion and by giving aid and comfort to its opponents.

I shall make no plea of confession and avoidance; neither shall I demur, in so far as I am arraigned upon the charges. If I appear at all, it is to declare myself the sole judge of my political faith and party loyalty. My responsibility is to the people of North Dakota, and not to a little group of Senators from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Kentucky.

Let me paraphrase the statement of a celebrated historian and political philosopher: There never was a perfect man; it would be the height of absurdity to expect a perfect political party or a perfect assembly. Large bodies are far more apt to err than individuals. The fear of punishment is lessened and the sense of shame is diminished by partition. Every day we see men do for their party or faction what they would die rather than do for themselves. No quarrel ever happens in which all the right lies on one side and all the wrong lies on the other.

THE TWO GREAT PARTIES

A division separates a great nation into two parties, each containing many members who differ much less from their moderate opponents than from their violent allies. Each counts among its supporters many whose allegiance is determined by some accident of inheritance, association, or local situation. Each attracts to itself in large numbers the fierce ambitions and the adventurous souls to whom the turmoil and confusion of political battle fields are the breath of life.

A political party, like an army, has universally two guards—the one, always in the van, proceeds to "drive the road and bridge the ford," pioneering—the vanguard, always locating advantageous positions—vigilant, resourceful, valiant, and anticipating the movements of the foe, preparing the way for the main body of the army to follow.

The safety and success of the whole army depends on the courage and fidelity of its vanguard.

Every party, as well as every army, has its rear guard, called the black guard, composed of people who thrive as parasites upon its custom; the sutlers, camp followers, who impede

its progress, give no aid in its operations, have no interest in its successes, save as they can profit by the gleanings of its battle fields; who relax its discipline and dishonor its flag; who after a disaster are prepared to cut the throats and rifle the camps of their companions. This tatterdemalion company of ragamuffins and scullions is the blackguard of every political party, as of every army, known to history.

The Republican Party has not been exempt from this universal difficulty in all associations organized to promote the ideas of pioneers in the march of social and political progress.

All Americans who take interest enough in public affairs and who believe in a republican form of Government, a theory of political society in which there is a periodic appeal to the people for mandates on public policy and for the selection of the official exponents of such policy when once determined at the ballot box, are republicans, while all those who believe in a Government of the people by the people and for the people are generically democrats, since that is the clearest possible statement of democratic political philosophy extant. And at the same time every citizen who believes in better things in the way of public policy or in the administration of the affairs and business of our Government and who lends his efforts to bring improvements into effect is an independent and a progressive, no matter what may be his party association.

Such a citizen, no matter what his party, will be found always in the vanguard of his party, striving to shape its advance toward the highest, safest ground.

I am and have been a Republican as to party association since I have been able to distinguish between party principles in American public life. I have maintained at all times and in every appropriate relation the principles of the party of Lincoln, of Sumner, of Hoar.

With no such interregnum of opposed policy as to affect results, the Republican Party has had practically complete control of political developments in our Nation for 64 years, two generations of man's life. The one vital element of principle that gave the party both its virtue and its power was freedom.

Having risen to power, secured the confidence of the people by reason of its great service to mankind in preserving the Union and abolishing the last vestiges of chattel slavery, the Republican Party became and is responsible to the people for the conditions that now obtain in the Republic. Drunk with power, forgetting its traditions, it proceeded to centralization, surrender of the Nation's money functions to financial buccaneers, surrender of the Nation's taxing power to tariff magnates, a squandering of the public lands and natural resources, ventures in imperialism for the sole benefit of partisan satraps, still further centralization in usurping the powers of States to regulate intrastate industries, and transforming the Government of the people by the people and for the people that was Lincoln's ideal into a government of the masses by the classes for the less than 5 per cent of all the people who have under Republican legislation and administration acquired possession of practically three-fourths of all the wealth accumulated by the labor of five generations of Americans.

In all this record of departure from the original Republican Party policy of human freedom there has been established a form of human slavery more vicious and insidious, more fraught with peril, not only to the party but to the Republic as well, than the system of bondage that was abolished by the Nation under the leadership of the original Republican Party.

In the making of this record the policy of the dominant faction of the party was constantly opposed by many of its members, while it was at the same time powerfully aided by so-called deserters from the opposing party. The major responsibility for existing conditions must ever rest in future history upon the Republican Party.

If to be a Republican I am to accept and ratify, defend, and promote a political policy of a party that exults in the accomplishment of these results without protest, without exhausting my abilities to correct these fatal errors of the past and prevent their repetition in the future, then I can not qualify.

If one can contemplate the Bacchanalian orgy, the debauch of frenzied finance now in process in the financial capital of the Nation, without realizing the intimacies between the responsible leaders and managers of the Republican Party and the piratical beneficiaries of a so-called Republican triumph, he deserves sympathy.

If the election of a Republican as President with a reliable working majority in Congress means nothing more than an extension for four years of an unlimited license to profiteer or to plunder the American people, then I cannot be a Re-

publican. If the transfer of five billions of capital values from the farms and producers of America to the swollen fortunes of monopoly within three weeks' time is a triumph of the Republican Party, then, indeed, is the party of Lincoln doomed.

THE FARMERS ARE OPPRESSED, AND WHY?

Mr. President, so able an authority as Mr. Taber, master of the National Grange, at the annual convention at Atlantic City, states that the mortgage indebtedness of the American farmers now amounts to the stupendous sum of \$14,000,000,000.

Is it any wonder then that 1,200,000 farmers, or one-fifth of the farmers of America, have been forced to leave the farm since 1920 and seek a livelihood in the great industrial centers? This means that not less than 6,000,000 persons from the farms are now seeking to live in the cities rather than on the farms because forced by bankruptcy to do so and, in my humble judgment, largely because of the injustice done them by the Government, since they were not permitted the blessings they had a right to expect of "equal justice to all." Congress played into privilege—the money-lending and industrial cities of the East.

The farmers, for example, of the spring-wheat belt had the price of their commodity fixed by the Government at below cost of production and all industry and privilege were permitted to profiteer off them without hint or hindrance. Is it any wonder, then, that they are oppressed and this by governmental action and policy?

Mr. President, I do not believe the main body of the Republican Party, the man in the street, the average citizen of the Republic, who has supported the candidates of the Republican Party in season and out of season, because of an instinctive or inherited faith that the men who shaped its modern policies were inspired by the original principles and the great traditions of its early purposes and achievements, would or will continue to follow a leadership that is recruited from the blackguard of its membership once they know and understand the meaning of the reversion that has taken possession of the leadership and management of the great army that constitutes their old-time Republican Party.

The original war cry of the party—free land, free speech, free men—has lost its inspiring appeal. With land, natural opportunity, absorbed and controlled; with freedom of speech enjoined, interdicted, only when it threatens to expose the meaning of monopoly; with the average man free to contract only under duress, under the compulsions enforced by the natural necessities of life, on the one hand, and by laws made by monopoly to maintain itself in a world of increasing knowledge on the other.

The camp followers of the old Republican Party have become the vanguard of the new Republican Party—leading it backward and downward from the heights where Lincoln left it when he fell. I concede the majority of the caucus may be sincere in their evident belief that Dives is the Savior of society and the sole purpose of creation; that the Lazzaroni are created for the sole purpose to glorify, exalt, and to support the "glittering show" upon the heights.

I have perhaps foolishly believed, and I certainly have hoped, that the party to which I have given a life service still retained enough historic vision, even though it were entirely oblivious to the obligations of its inheritance, to consider its own future safety and continued existence.

But the caucus notifies the American people, notifies the Members of this body, that no appeal to the rank and file of the Republican Party will be tolerated; "tolerare non potest" is the decree of the collegium—"we are the Republican Party; we make its laws; we provide its tests, its sanctions; we decree its disciplines."

SOME LOCAL COLOR

I have never complained or made objection to certain practices met in my own experience; nor do I complain now in requesting the proponents of the caucus resolution of expulsion to explain upon what theory they reconcile this resolution with the action of the Republican National Committee in the campaign of 1920 in not supporting the nominee of the party for the United States Senate. In that year the Republicans of my State nominated, by direct popular primary, a candidate to represent in part that State in the Senate of the Nation.

In addition to the treachery and betrayal of the national committee Republican speakers, Republican newspapers, Republican Party agents, representatives, and officials openly and actively and by every means at their command worked, spoke, wrote, published, and intrigued to defeat the Republican candidate. The fact that this party treason was ineffectual is in itself a demonstration that there still remain sufficient virtues

of the original Republican spirit to justify every effort to reclaim the party from its worship of false gods.

In 1922, in the case of my colleague, the same tactics and program were followed. The present supporters of President Coolidge in North Dakota received \$10,000 from the Democratic National Committee to bring about the defeat of the Republican candidate by openly supporting the Democratic candidate, but most fortunately for the country and for the Republican Party they failed to accomplish their purpose.

Again, in 1924, the Republican Party of my State nominated a State ticket, and the same program was followed. The money raised in Eastern States for the Republican National Campaign Committee, to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, was, according to newspaper reports of the committee investigating campaign expenses, used in North Dakota and other Western States to defeat Republican candidates.

Mr. President, lest we forget, I wish to remind the worthy gentlemen who constitute the members which make up the majority of the caucus held November 28, that Mr. Hanna, who is in charge of the Coolidge interests in North Dakota, and who, according to documentary evidence, claims to have the assurance from the administration that he is to be the official distributor of Federal patronage in the State, is former Congressman Hanna. Mr. Hanna, in 1912, left his work in Congress to take charge of the Roosevelt campaign against Mr. Taft in the presidential primaries held in March, 1912. Mr. Hanna is a relative of the famous Mark Hanna, of Ohio, Republican boss of former days. He is also related to Dan Hanna, who was one of the leading spirits in the Bull Moose Party, and contributed \$25,000 toward the election of Mr. Roosevelt.

Let me ask, in all candor: Had the senior Senator from Wisconsin been the nominee of the Republican convention instead of Mr. Coolidge, how many of the majority members of the caucus would have given him their support?

The entire motive behind the "cabal," now the caucus, has ever been the frustration of every social interest, of truth itself, whenever it threatens to interfere with special interest.

It has the motive of the Camorra, the Black Hand, the Facismo, to prevent the expression of ideas that question the infallibility of special judgments, regardless of their conformity with the facts of life or the laws and principles embedded in the nature of things, social, economic, and industrial.

The caucus is an ancient institution. Its original purpose and uniform practice have been to nullify and abort the will of majorities through the power of organized minorities, the nomination of candidates, the enactment or defeat of measures, control of legislation, discipline of parties and individuals. In all its history the most of the numerous expressions of public opinion were hostile to the caucus. Niles' Register, Volume XXIV, page 99, states that—

"out of 35 Virginia journals only 3 were for the caucus; in Ohio 1 journal in 48 was favorable; in New York 10 out of 125; in Pennsylvania 3 out of 100; in Maryland 2 out of 20; in Vermont 2 out of 13."

It was the object, the purpose of the caucus to defeat, nullify public opinion by extraconstitutional processes that aroused popular opposition to the caucus in those now far-off days. That its objective centers on the protection of monopoly rather than on the nomination of candidates has only intensified the opposition to caucus rule.

EVADING THE RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. President, it occurs to me that there are those who sat in the council of this notorious conference of November 28, those who were quick to take unto themselves arrogance of power. It is hard for me to understand the line of reasoning and logic which enables them to gather from the results of the recent election any special approbation of their acts or record in public office or any mandate to them to take action upon the part of the people.

May I not be considered unkind in here directing attention to the fact that the recent Republican campaign was not conducted on a basis of Republican performance. There was no attempt to justify Republican statesmanship. The logic of the situation in scores of contests, including the House and the Senate, was such that the candidates on the Republican ticket for reelection were placed in the delicate position of having to ignore the achievements of the administration, as well as having to withhold their indorsement of the President, for the reason that had they done so they would have condemned their own record in Congress for the preceding two years, because of the fact that in practically all instances where the issue was between the President and the Congress

their votes would show that they were opposed to the President's recommendations. In this connection I would respectfully submit these facts to the caucus which assembled on November 28 for such action as it may deem best to take.

Early in the campaign the advisory committee adopted the policy of evasion of responsibility as to the startling revelations of exploitation and corruption brought out against the Republican administration as evidenced in the respective investigations held during 1923-24. They rang the changes on the slogan that "guilt is personal," and therefore that the President could not be held to accountability because of the fact that those officials whose conduct was called in question were appointed by the former President.

Personally, I believe that such an argument would eventually undermine the very foundations of our Government. If such a precedent were established, it would mean a regular systematic program of exploitation in the different departments of the Government, with the understanding that the party could get an immunity bath by selecting every four years a new leader who would claim that he could not be held responsible for the acts of former officials of the administration.

"The people owe it to their public servants to commend and encourage them when they do well, and it is not only the privilege but the duty of the people to condemn and rebuke officials when they betray their trusts. When public servants become the agents of the people to carry out their will they take an oath that they will be honest and faithful. If they violate that oath they ought not to expect the people to be more considerate of their feelings than they have been of their rights. If they sell out they have no reason to complain if the people turn them out. If they have received their price they ought not to murmur if the people pursue their remedy by selecting others to represent them. Why should a party support officials who have brought disgrace upon it by their unfaithfulness? When an official disregards the claims of the public upon him his party could not, or should not, escape the responsibility in the matter. No party can defend a corrupt official without assuming responsibility for his acts."

In many States of the Union, as well as the national administration, the Republican Party has suffered because of corrupt officials. Instead of condoning a crime as a matter of principle a party should lose no time in making an example of every guilty official. Only by so doing can the party stand for public honor and fidelity to public interests.

The constant repetition of "chaos," the "Constitution," "anarchy," the "red flag and the red army," the "destruction of our American institutions, churches, schools, and courts," with the threat of starvation to the millions of American voters who live within lines that are circumscribed and where it is necessary always to keep the sentinel of economy on the walls, decided the election in favor of the idle rich, who know no party or religion and who do not hesitate to override the law and defy the Government when it suits their purpose, and who in some instances would even dispute the authority of Jehovah Himself.

The American voter will not remain very long in the dark as to the deception practiced on him during the campaign. (The court of public opinion, which is always the court of last resort, will be only too glad to declare the contract entered into on November 3 void because of the victory being obtained through misrepresentation.)

WILL IT ALWAYS BE THUS?

Mr. President, when I reflect on the evidence as presented in the management of the Veterans' Bureau with its graft and incompetency; of the Daugherty scandals; of the Teapot Dome oil scandals; of the \$100,000 and the black satchel, and many other questionable transactions of the past four years that have shocked the moral fiber of the people of the country, I am reminded of the statement in Plutarch's Lives of Aristides, which I quote:

Being chosen to the charge of the public revenue, he made it appear that not only those of his time, but the preceding officers, had alienated much treasure, and especially Themistocles:

Well known he was an able man to be,
But with his fingers apt to be too free.

Therefore, Themistocles associating several persons against Aristides, and impeaching him when he gave in his accounts, caused him to be condemned of robbing the public; so Idomeneus states; but the best and chiefest men of the city much resenting it, he was not only exempted from the fine imposed upon him, but likewise again called to the same employment. Pretending now to repent him of his former practice, and carrying himself with more remissness, he became more acceptable to such as pillaged the treasury, by not detecting or calling

them to an exact account. So that those who had their fill of the public money began highly to applaud Aristides, and sued to the people, making interest to have him once more chosen treasurer. But when they were upon the point of election, he reproved the Athenians.

"When I discharged my office well and faithfully," said he, "I was insulted and abused; but now that I have allowed the public thieves in a variety of malpractices, I am considered an admirable patriot. I am more ashamed, therefore, of this present honor than the former sentence; and I commiserate your condition, with whom it is more praiseworthy to oblige ill men than to conserve the revenue of the public." Saying thus, and proceeding to expose the thefts that had been committed, he stopped the mouths of those who cried him up and vouched for him, but gained real and true commendation from the best men.

Mr. President, I can readily understand, if it is the purpose to soft-pedal the investigations that might further uncover a cancerous growth in the body politic, why my presence might not be desired, but not upon the ground that I am not a Republican.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that perhaps the most influential individual who supported President Coolidge was Mr. Henry Ford, Republican politicians recognized him as a most valuable Coolidge asset.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial on this question which appeared in Mr. Henry Ford's paper, the Dearborn Independent, in its issue of December 13, 1924, be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

ON WHAT MEAT HAVE THESE CÆSARS FED?

The report that independent and insurgent Senators were to be "read out" of the Republican Party made an impression of queerness on the public mind. There was even an element of amusement in it. An element of serious concern, too, for is this all that the Republican Party has learned from the elections? By what right does anyone interpret the election of Mr. Coolidge as a mandate to suppress the spirit of self-criticism so essential to the balance and efficiency of a party in power?

It may be inaccurate to lay this action to the "Republican Party," since the party has not been consulted about it. Republican officeholders at Washington do not constitute the Republican Party. Republican Senators do not constitute the Sanhedrin of the Republican Party. In fact, the Republican Party as represented by the Washington officeholders was discredited and beaten and would now have been facing a woeful 4th of March had not the personality of Calvin Coolidge commanded the suffrage of the people. Wherefore, then, do these officeholders, who owe their presence in Washington to Republican votes, take it upon themselves to oust from party councils men just as honest and earnest as themselves, who owe their presence at Washington to an equally impressive mandate of Republican votes?

To say that Senator LA FOLLETTE and Senator LADD shall have no voice in the counsels of the party is equal to saying that the people of Wisconsin and North Dakota are ousted from the Republican majority of the United States. It simply can not be done, and only men blinded to the import of the times would think of attempting it. We mention Senators LA FOLLETTE and LADD especially because these are personalities of such eminent respectability and their work has been of such a character that a protest is roused in their behalf in the very citadel of American fair-mindedness. When their own constituents repudiate these Senators it will be time for party councils to consider action. Until then they are Senators of the United States and representatives of great Commonwealths. And they are more than that—they are representatives of certain tendencies in American political thought to which the Republican Party will have to give serious heed during the next four years or find itself in a more critical situation than it was this year. Admittedly there are blowhards among the Senators called "progressives"; there are shallow-pated notoriety seekers who are "insurgents" simply because they have neither the ability nor the experience to be "regular"; but neither LADD nor LA FOLLETTE fits these descriptions. They are men of experience and attainments, and their presence in the Senate has been useful to the Nation.

True, the Nation rejected LA FOLLETTE for the Presidency and will continue to do so, but it also rejected Taft and Hughes. It is not every man who should be President. But Taft and Hughes have found places of usefulness in the public service, and so has Mr. LA FOLLETTE. To attempt to read him out of the Republican Party is to exhibit a degree of partisan swell-headedness possible only to the most egregious political pompousness. It will give the ultraradicals who fastened on the candidacy of LA FOLLETTE for their own ends a new battle cry. It will accentuate the tendency toward hidebound superiority in Republican Party councils. Above all, it will notify the country that the Old Guard of Republicanism interpret the elections as a private grant of power, and it is certainly anything but that. Had the voting public

believed that such an interpretation would be made of their action, the result would have been different. Anyone who can derive a justification of high-handedness from the last election is by that fact judged as politically incompetent.

In the last analysis, it is not the fate of the excommunicated Senators that matters. If the taboo stands, they will doubtless find many compensations in the reaction which will follow throughout the country. The regrettable element is that the party in power should exhibit such petulant narrowness, such childish resentment of healthy criticism, such dwarfed views of party dignity.

The way to purge a party of insurgency is to make the party so big and clean and progressive that forward-looking men will not have to go outside to find a place to work. The Republican Party will die earlier from the dry rot of the Old Guard than it will from the political aliveness of men who believe that the first duty of any party is to serve the people as a whole.

It would require a lot of testimony to make the people believe that President Coolidge is in sympathy with this ouster movement.

ON WHAT THRIVE YE?

Mr. LADD. I am not sure, Mr. President, on what these "Caesars" had been feeding at the morning breakfast table now so famous. They certainly must have felt the power that radiates near the throne!

O, consistency! Where is thy sting? If I may be allowed to use such a phrase.

What about these Republican Caesars and their scepter of authority? What about their party regularity? What about their consistency with which they mete out discipline and party punishment?

If I mistake not, the distinguished Senator, who has been elevated to the leadership of the Republicans in this body, only a few years ago, when defeated for the Republican nomination for Senator in the State of Kansas, turned around and supported the Democratic candidate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LADD. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. The Republican nominee in Kansas in 1912 did not receive the majority vote at the primary but was nominated under the district plan. The senior Senator from Kansas received the popular vote in the primary. The nominee, after he was nominated as a Republican, deserted the Republican nominees, Taft and Sherman. The senior Senator from Kansas notified the Republican nominee that if he would vote for and support the Republican nominees, Taft and Sherman, he would devote all of his time and pay his own expenses to help elect him and the other Republican nominees. He refused to do it, and then the senior Senator from Kansas proceeded to canvass the State at his own expense to defeat the man who had deserted the Republican nominees for President and Vice President, and would do it again.

Mr. LADD. I am glad to have that statement from the Senator. Yet, to-day, he complacently marshals his forces in the great Senate of the United States and leads them into battle. The great leader of the great Republican majority of the great Sixty-eighth Congress!

Party discipline? Who would dare discipline the Senator from Kansas, the gentleman who for so long, under the leadership of the lamented Mr. Lodge, cracked the whip over Republican backs in this body. By the same method of discipline, Mr. President, 1912 would have seen the decease of the National Republican Party.

It will be recalled that it was facetiously said on that occasion that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] was walking around with one-half of the electoral vote of Mr. Taft stuck in his vest pocket.

It is interesting to recall, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] received 60 per cent more electoral votes in 1924 than did Mr. Taft in 1912. Please do not forget that Mr. Taft was the regular nominee of the Republican Party.

Where have gone all those who followed the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt in 1912? Were they read out of the party? Were they justified in leaving?

Are the men who are responsible for the acts of this memorable, historic, and notorious conference on November 28 consistent? Are they really sincere and earnest? Do they conscientiously strive for party harmony and for the good of the American people? What is their purpose? Are they playing cheap politics? Are they working for the American people? Or do they have a bigger game at stake? Just what is their game?

A little bit of the history of 1912 might prove refreshing if we but rehearse it here.

In view of the fact that Theodore Roosevelt was to have been the Republican nominee by acclamation in 1920, had he lived, and in view of the further fact that you may not recall just exactly the principles for which he stood in 1912, let me refresh your memory as to what they were.

I ask that this statement, together with Roosevelt's address on that occasion, taken from the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT ROOSEVELT STOOD FOR

Preferential primaries in presidential years.
Election of United States Senators by popular vote.
The short ballot limiting the number of officials to be voted for.
A stringent and efficient corrupt practices act applying to primaries as well as elections.
Publicity of campaign contributions.
Initiative, referendum, and recall.
Recall of judicial decisions.
Simplifying the process for amendment to the Constitution.
Strengthening of the pure food law.
Establishment of a national health department.
Social and industrial justice to wage workers, including a minimum wage.
Insurance and old-age pensions for employees.
Regulation of conditions of labor hours of work for women, prohibition of child labor.
Federal control of trusts.
A national industrial commission, controlling all interstate industries.
Revision of the tariff in the interest of the employee and consumer.
A permanent tariff commission, nonpartisan.
Land monopoly tax.
Suffrage for women.
Regulation of hearings in contempt cases.
Internal waterway improvements.
Reform of the currency to give greater elasticity.
Conservation of forests, mines, and water power.
Development and control of the Mississippi River.
Government ownership of Alaska railroads.
Leasing system for Alaska coal fields.
A larger Navy.
Fortification of the Panama Canal and strict observance of the canal treaty.

ROOSEVELT'S ADDRESS

His memorable preliminary speech on that occasion was as follows:
"To you, men and women, who have come here to this great city of this great State formally to launch a new party, a party of the people of the whole Union, the National Progressive Party, I extend my hearty greeting. You are taking a bold and greatly needed step for the service of our beloved country.

"The old parties are husks, with no real soul within either, divided on artificial lines, boss-ridden and privilege-controlled, each a jumble of incongruous elements, and neither daring to speak out wisely and fearlessly what should be said on the vital issues of the day.

"This new movement is a movement of truth, sincerity, and wisdom, a movement which proposes to put at the service of all our people the collective power of the people through their governmental agencies, alike in the Nation and in the several States. We propose boldly to face the real and great questions of the day, and not skillfully to evade them, as do the old parties. We propose to raise aloft a standard to which all honest men can repair and under which all can fight, no matter what their past political differences, if they are content to face the future and no longer to dwell among the dead issues of the past. We propose to put forth a platform which shall not be a platform of the ordinary and insincere kind, but shall be a contract with the people; and if the people accept this contract by putting us in power we shall hold ourselves under honorable obligation to fulfill every promise it contains as loyally as if it were actually enforceable under the penalties of the law.

NO HOPE FOR THE OLD PARTIES

"The prime need to-day is to face the fact that we are now in the midst of a great economic revolution. There is urgent necessity of applying both common sense and the highest ethical standard to this movement for better economic conditions among the mass of our people if we are to make it one of healthy evolution and not one of revolution.

"It is from the standpoint of our country, wicked as well as foolish, longer to refuse to face the real issues of the day. Only by so facing them can we go forward; and to do this we must break up the old party organizations and obliterate the old cleavage lines on the dead issues inherited from 50 years ago. Our fight is a fundamental fight against both of the old corrupt party machines, for both are under the dominion of the plunder league of the professional politicians, who

are controlled and sustained by the great beneficiaries of privilege and reaction. How close is the alliance between the two machines is shown by the attitude of that portion of those Northeastern newspapers, including the majority of the great dailies in all the northeastern cities—Boston, Buffalo, Springfield, Hartford, Philadelphia, and, above all, New York—which are controlled by or representative of the interests which, in popular phrase, are conveniently grouped together as the Wall Street interests.

"If this country is really to go forward along the path of social and economic justice, there must be a new party of nation-wide and nonsectional principles, a party where the titular national chiefs and the real State leaders shall be in genuine accord, a party in whose councils the people shall be supreme, a party that shall represent in the Nation and the several States alike the same cause, the cause of human rights and of governmental efficiency. At present both of the old parties are controlled by professional politicians in the interests of the privileged classes, and apparently each has set up as its ideal of business and political development a government by financial despotism tempered by make-believe political assassination. Democrats and Republicans alike, they represent government of the needy, many by professional politicians in the interests of the rich few. This is class government and class government of a peculiarly unwholesome kind.

THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO RULE

"It seems to me, therefore, that the time is ripe and overripe for a genuine progressive movement, nation wide and justice loving, sprung from and responsible to the people themselves, and sundered by a great gulf from both of the old party organizations, while representing all that is best in the hopes, beliefs, and aspirations of the plain people, who make up the immense majority of the rank and file of both old parties."

Mr. LADD. May I suggest, Mr. President, that the platform of Roosevelt in 1912 made the 1924 campaign of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE in respect to radicalism, bolshevism, and anarchism, together with all the malicious epithets hurled against the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin pale into insignificance, yet the distinguished Roosevelt was not read out of the Republican Party, and had anyone attempted it they would have but carved the elephant's epitaph on the Republican tombstone carelessly erected in the graveyard of oblivion. Yet it is not that these same men and their friends did not say unkind things about Roosevelt. They even charged him with being a Benedict Arnold to his party.

THEN THEY CONDEMNED HIM

Let me quote from an editorial in the Marion Star of September 25, 1912. It will be recalled that the Marion Star was then owned by Hon. Warren G. Harding, who later became President of the United States. The editorial was as follows:

We are opposed to Theodore Roosevelt because we believe him to be unsuited in character and temperament to be Chief Executive; because he is an unsafe and dangerous leader; because he is lawless, insincere, selfish, and unscrupulous; because his first administration was unsuccessful in maintaining the prosperity he inherited; because he is a bully by nature and a lover of war, and is, therefore, not to be trusted with the control of the Army and Navy and our relations with our neighbors.

But on October 31, 1912, Mr. President, the Marion Star went even further than this when it said:

The entire Roosevelt campaign is based on selfishness, false pretenses, envy, and spite. It is a concentration of all forces of failure and discontent, of indicted money kings and discredited political bosses. They rallied about the personality of the most self-seeking politician this country has ever known, the most arbitrary boss the party has ever suffered under, the most dangerous agitator who has ever threatened the perpetuity of government.

In an address before the Brooklyn Academy of Music in 1912 Senator Harding said this:

I am going to square myself with you Bull Moosers by stating that I have just as heartily applauded Colonel Roosevelt as you did. I have stood upon the platform and commended him to my fellow Americans. We owe him much for the awakening of the American conscience. But, just the same, I applauded Benedict Arnold at Saratoga and did not at Tarrytown some time after.

It may be of interest to note that upon the death of Theodore Roosevelt Senator Harding had this to say of him:

NOW THEY EULOGIZE HIM

He was one of the foremost citizens of the world in a most extraordinary era, as he was the most vigorous and courageous American of his time. In spite of conflicts in which he was critic or the subject of criticism, he was respected as no other American. There is no direct legatee of his vast political estate.

And the distinguished late Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, in connection with the Roosevelt Memorial, said:

He was a great patriot, a great man, above all a great American. His country was the ruling master passion of his life from the beginning even unto the end. What a man was is even more important than what he did. Theodore Roosevelt always believed that character was of greater worth and moment than anything else. He possessed abilities of the first order, which he was disposed to underrate because he set so much greater store upon the moral qualities which we bring together under the single word "character."

PENROSE'S TRIBUTE

You will doubtless be surprised, Mr. President, when you recall that Senator Penrose, of Pennsylvania, made this statement regarding the passing of Theodore Roosevelt:

He was one of the greatest men of his generation, not only at home, but abroad. His personality has been deeply impressed on the age in which he lived and he will stand as a prominent and personal figure in history. During a recent period the country owes him a debt of gratitude in the way in which he urged the importance of preparedness and in his unselfish demands for the high standards of Americanism. His untimely taking off is a national loss and a source of national grief.

The statement of Mr. Penrose is more astonishing by reason of the fact that the New York Times on October 5, 1912, quoted Theodore Roosevelt as having said this of Mr. Penrose:

Mr. Penrose testifies that he advised Mr. Archbold to have the Standard Oil Co. submit to the blackmail and that he did it for fear that they would incur hostility in certain quarters. They could only incur the hostility of myself, the President, the Attorney General, and of the Commissioner of Corporations, with, I suppose his superior, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Now I want to call your attention to the fact that they could incur my hostility only if they violated the law. I could not be hostile to them, and I had no way of being hostile to them if they obeyed the law any more than a policeman can be hostile to any man here unless he disobeys the law. So that the purpose of Mr. Penrose in advising Archbold to have the Standard Oil make that contribution could only have been to secure it against Government action taken because it had violated the law.

I have been police commissioner. If it were proved to me when I was police commissioner that any policeman had done in reference to a law-breaking liquor seller or gambler what Senator Penrose admits he did—he, a Senator of the United States—in connection with the Standard Oil Co., I would have thrown that policeman off the force, and I hold that the Senate of the United States should throw Mr. Penrose out of the Senate on the admission that he has himself made before this committee.

SENATOR PEPPER'S EULOGY

Mr. President, at the Roosevelt Memorial meeting held at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 9, 1919, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] expressed himself as follows:

Surely his spirit was unquenchable. There has been nothing like it in our time. No task daunted him, nothing could discourage him. Nobody could down him. If he was beaten, he never knew it. With reverent affection let us even doubt whether he admits that he is dead. I am not prepared to admit it myself. A world without Theodore Roosevelt would be too stale, too flat, too unprofitable, and too uninteresting to live in. He must live on—not merely as a memory but as a continuing and vitalizing force. If there were others to take his place, we might breathe a prayer over his grave and let him rest in peace; but there is nobody like him. Where the Colonel leads we are sure of the direction in which we are moving. When he gives commands we are not in doubt about our objective.

THEY CONDEMN THOSE THEY DO HONOR

Mr. President, it will not be unkind to recall that one of the first official acts of President Harding upon his inauguration on March 4, 1921, was to appoint Theodore Roosevelt, jr., as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. There can be but little doubt that he was the personal choice of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] for Governor of the Empire State in 1924.

May I relate some recent history?

When Mr. Roosevelt resigned as Assistant Secretary of the Navy to make his ill-fated race for the governorship of the Empire State, President Coolidge appointed to his place Theodore Douglas Robinson, a nephew of the late Theodore Roosevelt, who was his campaign manager in the State of New York as chairman of the Bull Moose Party in 1912, which chairmanship he retained until 1914.

If I recall correctly, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCOORMICK] was one of those who followed the peerless Roosevelt.

To-day he ranks high in the Republican organization in the Senate. I believe he was a member in good standing of and gave full-fledged allegiance to this notorious caucus of November 28, 1924. Further, we even have a suggestion from the press that the distinguished Senator may become the American Ambassador to France in the near future.

Further, we do not want to forget that that most excellent gentleman from the State of Washington, Senator Poindexter, was another of the Roosevelt supporters, and Mr. Harding rewarded him with the ambassadorship to Peru.

SOME DOUBLE SWITCHES

Further, the famous trust buster, Senator Kellogg, from Minnesota, who also followed the Roosevelt trail in 1912, replaced the distinguished Col. George Harvey as ambassador to the Court of St. James, and I would not slight Colonel Harvey because he is very sensitive and I would not wound his feelings.

Who can forget that he was the gentleman who was heralded as having discovered the late Woodrow Wilson while Governor of New Jersey, and tried to get him out in the presidential limelight, and whose activities in behalf of Mr. Wilson became so annoying as to cause that gentleman to write Mr. Harvey requesting that he refrain from further supporting him, as he felt that his support was a hindrance rather than a help. Mr. Harvey later gave free rein to his vitriolic pen in a publication known as Harvey's Weekly. This seemed to qualify him for an ambassadorship to the Court of St. James during the Harding administration.

STEAM-ROLLER CONTROL OF REPUBLICAN CONVENTIONS

Mr. President, I am sure there is no person who is at all familiar with the trend of political events bold enough to question the statement that the same influences which controlled the Republican Convention at Chicago in 1912 also controlled the Republican Conventions of 1916, 1920, and 1924. The same old steam roller was used in every instance, and I am satisfied that if any person took the trouble to examine the roller used in the 1924 convention at Cleveland he would find beneath a new coat of paint, on every bolt and burr, and on each separate part of the machinery, the initials "W. H. T."

In this connection I wish to quote a statement made by representative Republicans protesting against the procedure and tactics of those in charge of the preliminary organization of the convention of 1912:

A FAMOUS PROTEST

Representing as we do the Republicans of our respective States—or the delegation duly elected to the National Republican Convention—we announce that hereafter the matter may be one of record that you are prostituting your positions, violating every tenet of fair dealing and decency and assassinating the Republican Party. You are perpetrating gross frauds and disfranchising Republicans of different States. You are engaged in a deliberate attempt to thwart the will of the rank and file of the Republican Party and thus to convert the party of progress into one of reaction. You know this, we know it, and the Nation knows it. We in our individual capacity and the Republicans whom we represent will not tolerate or submit to your illegal, outrageous, and larcenous act. We demand that you reconsider your unlawful action thus far taken, that you cease your assaults on the integrity of the Republican Party, and that you perform your functions in Republican fashion, with fairness and with honesty. Unless you rescind your fraudulent decisions upon you shall rest the responsibility for the attempt to assassinate the Republican Party, and for all time to come you will have the contempt and execration of all liberty-loving, square-thinking, and reputable citizens.

WM. E. GLASSCOCK,

Governor of West Virginia and Delegate at Large.

GORDON D. WHITING,

M. O. Congressman-elect for New Jersey.

ROBT. MCCORMICK,

Illinois.

A. L. GARFORD, *Ohio.*

ED. C. CARRINGTON,

Maryland.

MARION BUTLER,

North Carolina.

WM. FLINN,

Delegate, Pennsylvania.

D. B. BEARD, *Arizona.*

W. R. STUBBS,

Governor of Kansas.

S. S. MCINCH,

North Carolina.

ROBERT S. VESSEY,

Governor of South Dakota.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON,

Governor of California and Chairman of California Delegation.

NORRIS SCORES THEIR HYPOCRISY

Mr. President, to show further the disapproval of one of the party leaders who has always had the real interests of the party at heart and who to-day is one of the leading exponents of the principles of the party of Lincoln, I now want to refer to a speech delivered by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who was at that time a Member of the House.

On pages 9641-9643 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1912, Mr. NORRIS said:

I believe that the time will come—God grant that it may come soon—when the man who controls a convention or a nomination by the bribery of patronage will be held in the estimation of the American people to be just as guilty as the man who bribes by the payment of the cold cash. When that time comes the political boss will be standing upon his political St. Helena, looking across the sad waves at disappearing worlds that once were his and whose people formerly bowed down before his throne in humility and submission.

The evil of political control by patronage is not confined alone to the officeholders themselves. Many of the political bosses do not occupy public positions. They get their pay not directly from the Federal Treasury but by the control of appointments; they receive their compensation in thousands of devious ways by the favor extended to them through public officials who hold official positions on account of their recommendation. Political machines could not live overnight were it not for the wonderful power of patronage.

I have been opposed to political machines, to boss control, and to caucus rule, and it seemed to me it was my duty to proclaim what I believed to be right and to expose what I believed to be wrong just as quick when I find it in my party as though I found it in some other party. I want to say it has been sometimes a discouraging proposition. I know that I have lost many friendships, both on the floor of the House and in my State, but I would rather go down to defeat and into oblivion than to ride forever on the wave of victory with a guilty consciousness of having even by my silence given approval to what happened in Chicago, when in my heart I honestly believe it to be one of the worst political highway robberies that has ever been committed in this country. I want to close by expressing my sentiments and my feelings by using the words of the immortal Lincoln:

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody who stands right, stand with him while he is right, and part from him when he goes wrong."

Mr. President, the Progressives of 1912 and 1924 had no quarrel with the distinctive principles of the Republican Party as a party. Their protest was against the conspiracy of the leadership of those who had temporarily gotten control of the machinery of the organization and who had entered into a conspiracy to turn the party of their forbears over to the predatory interests of the country.

BORAH TAKES HIS STAND

Mr. President, if any proof is necessary to establish the fact that the machinery of the Republican Party is still in control with these same baneful influences, I will read from an address delivered by one of the most respected and able Members of this body.

The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in a speech delivered in his home State, made the following statement with regard to conditions that prevail in the party to-day:

I have followed my convictions in the past. I am sure you will expect me to do so in the future. I strive by all means within my power and to the limit of my ability to meet public questions in the light of the public interest.

I claim the right as your Senator to oppose any measure, by whomsoever proposed, which I believe to be injurious to the public interest or unwise in government. I claim the right to support any measure, by whomsoever proposed, which I believe to be in the public good and in the interest of sound government. This states the whole thing.

I would rather have the people of my State believe that I have the courage to vote as I think I ought to vote, regardless of passion or party, than to have any office they can give me.

A man who expects a great party to be always free from extravagance, to be free at all times from those who would use it for sinister or selfish ends, is grossly ignorant of the inevitable trend of all things political. It is one place above all others where there must be a constant fight against just such things.

The Saviour could not choose even 12 men all of whom would prove true against corruption. How shall it be expected that politics will always be clean of individual betrayers? The only thing a true partisan can do, a man who believes in his party and wants to serve it, is to denounce such things when they come, regardless of party.

Lorimerism and Newberryism should never be defended in the name of party. There is no room for such things in the party of Lincoln.

It is just as much the duty of a Republican to renovate his party of the stench of oil as it was of a Democrat to have denounced and held responsible the miserable crooks who grafted \$900,000,000 in the airplane enterprise.

This thing of keeping silence, of hushing up exposés, of apologizing for or smoothing over waste and extravagance and corruption, this thing of apologizing for class legislation or closing your eyes to the demands of privilege because they happen in your own party, is not true partisanship.

The men who have compromised if not imperiled the Republican Party, who have sent hundreds of thousands from its fold, are the men who while crying "Regular! Regular!" have defended Lorimerism and Newberryism, have piled taxes upon the people in order to create offices for slavish henchmen, have tolerated in the departments of Government the miserable spawn of broken-down political machines, these are the men who while crying, "Lord, Lord," have trampled under foot and blasphemed every great principle upon which the party was founded.

I despise them all. Politically I would dynamite the last one of them if I could. I look upon them as imperiling and humiliating the greatest political party in the annals of party history, a party which in dignity and power and glory has had no parallel in the history of free government.

Republicanism, as I understand it, is clean government. It is economic government. It is progressive government. No greater progressive ever lived than Lincoln.

Republicanism is government free from monopolistic control at home and equally free from domination and political entanglements abroad.

To all the foregoing I give hearty approval.

Mr. President, I wish to quote a news item that appeared in the New York Times of July 10, 1924, relating to the statement made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] at Detroit on July 9.

Senator COUZENS took the public into his confidence and specifically stated what his position would be in the campaign as to men and measures.

His statement is as follows:

COUZENS DEFIES "BOSSSES"—SEEKS REELECTION TO SENATE, BUT ACCEPTS PLATFORMS ONLY IN PART

DETROIT, July 9.—Senator JAMES COUZENS, Republican, of Michigan, announcing his candidacy for nomination at the September primaries to succeed himself, in a formal statement to-day refused to pledge his full support to President Coolidge or either State or National Republican platform. He challenged the right of party "bosses" to dictate his courses of action and made his bid for the vote of Michigan electors on his past record, for which he said he had no apologies to make.

Asked by the chairman of the Republican State central committee to sign a statement pledging his support to the party platform and endorsing President Coolidge, Senator COUZENS replied as follows:

"If complete adherence to the proposals and policies of President Coolidge is the test of Republicanism, there are no Republicans in the National Congress. I do not believe it to be the desire of my constituents that I abjectly promise to follow someone and do his bidding.

"No candidate can indorse both the State platform and President Coolidge 100 per cent, because they are in a measure inconsistent with each other.

"I believe in party government, but so long as I am a member of the party I propose to have a voice in it and not be controlled by party 'bosses' or leaders."

Mr. President, to the foregoing I can say "Amen" and give full adherence. I have ever sought to conduct my political course along the same path, and shall continue to do so with my constituents in North Dakota regardless of the dictates of my accusers from Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

PARTY LOYALTY AND PARTY CAUCUS

Mr. President, we are indebted to the action of the caucus for bringing the question of party loyalty to the front. Having had the pleasure of reading in former days the work of James Albert Woodburn, professor of American history and politics in Indiana University—I beg to call this to the attention of the genial Senator from Indiana—I feel that he has analyzed the question in a much more forceful way than I could present it. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have chapter 21, pages 295 to 303, inclusive, of his book entitled "Political Parties and Party Problems" printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE AND PARTY OBLIGATIONS

A problem that constantly confronts the intelligent voter is that of the conflict between his personal independence and his party obligation. To what extent is the citizen bound to subordinate himself in order to cooperate with party? There are a number of attitudes that a voter may assume toward parties involving varying degrees of independence.

1. He may abstain entirely from all political life and activity. He may look on the Constitution and the Government as godless and forsaken and refuse to vote or cooperate with any party or in any way support the political institutions or organizations of the country. Garrison and his abolition coadjutors did this. They would not vote nor hold office nor seek to put one of their advocates in office and, of course, they would attach themselves to no political party. They lived and spoke entirely on a moral plane. One may pursue this course also from utter indifference to public affairs or from a feeling that politics are "too dirty and corrupt" to give hope for purification and redemption. This attitude is that of the extremist in moral reform or in selfishness or of the political pessimist who gives over to faithless despair. There are not many of this class.

2. The voter may consent to vote and to influence voting, but avow no party allegiance whatever. These are the pure independents, who acknowledge no party obligations or ties of affection. They assume to act as judicial umpires between the parties, voting as readily with one party as with another, as they think the interests of the country demand. They may be represented as standing in the middle of the balancing board, giving the tilt first to one side, then to the other, but they are not a part of the game. This generally reduces one's participation to a choice between two courses prearranged by others, though the hope of receiving the weight of this element may influence the prearrangement. This class of voters is also relatively small.

3. On the other hand, the voter may be a blind or unscrupulous adherent of a party, supporting his party in every emergency, no matter whom it nominates or what policy it proposes. These are the unscrupulous managers or the unthinking party pawns with which the managers play the game. It has been estimated that fully eighty-five or ninety voters out of a hundred of the voting mass of a party may be absolutely relied upon by the party managers to follow the course marked out for them by the party convention or organization. Such men are governed in their voting by prejudices, tradition, and habit, not by any real opinion. That there are party managers and place seekers and ignorant voters who with cunning purpose or Bourbon stupidity are always ready to follow the party, regardless of party consistency or party principles, is not a matter of surprise. It is more surprising and more to be deplored that so large a proportion of honest men among the party voters consent to become the dupes of the unscrupulous, and by following their traditions and prejudices rather than their intelligence and conscience become the principal means by which knaves and rascals acquire political power for their own ends. If we could imagine the whole body of our citizenship assuming this attitude toward party and thus resigning the right or habit, we should have to reconcile ourselves to the inevitable decay of popular government by party. Party would degenerate into the ring, the clique, the faction, and party rule would be but the despotism of the boss.

4. But there is a large and growing element in our citizenship that does not assume any of these attitudes toward party. These believe in parties as a means of effecting political action. They identify themselves with a party and take part in party management, attend primaries and caucuses, help to conduct conventions, and make platforms and nominations. As party men they recognize the usefulness of parties, and believing in their own principles they are willing to adopt the party means of reducing these principles to practice; but with the spirit of true independence they hold their political principles above party success or party interests, and they will follow their convictions and their sense of the public welfare against the temporary decisions of the party organization.

Voters of this kind have a proper conception of and recognize the true office of party. The party managers and hidebound partisans are disposed to look upon a party as a disciplined army, to be directed by a commander in chief and his staff, while the voters, like machines or unthinking soldiers, are to move at the word of command. This, of course, is a perversion of the idea of party. A party is to represent the aggregate or composite opinion of its members. It exists for the purposes of its voters, not for the purposes of its managers. The party is not an end in itself; it has no claims apart from the claims of the cause that it represents. The party is a means to secure the common ends that its voters have in view. It is not merely an organization for the purpose of securing majorities, carrying elections, and getting the offices for the party workers. It may do these things as a means for working out the end for which it exists; but the party's constant and fundamental purpose is to stand for principles and to commit itself to policies in harmony with these

principles. A party is not a mere club, with tests of membership apart from, or above, its principles. It can not exact pledges to obey orders or to vote for all nominees that an obedient party machine may offer. No voter should think of party apart from, or above, its principles, and a party without principles, or the courage of its principles, is a paradox, and it can claim no allegiance from any citizen.

Burke's classic definition of party gives us as definite and at the same time as flexible an idea of the true party as we can anywhere find:

"A party is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some principle on which they are all agreed."

With this conception of party, true independence can be made consistent with true party allegiance. It is urged in behalf of party loyalty that parties are necessary to popular government; that they are expensive to organize and maintain, and that they should not be weakened and disorganized for transient and trivial reasons; that the "united wisdom" of the party is a safer guide than the individual judgment of any man, since "everybody knows more than anybody"; that, though the party may be temporarily wrong, the loyal party man should think of it as the party of his fathers that has rendered the country great services in the past, and the plea is made that its strength should be conserved for the sake of greater services in the future; that if men desert the party they weaken their influence for good government by weakening or destroying their influence with the party, thereby injuring their future usefulness; that men should not expect to keep "running in and out of a party"; that they should belong to a party completely, with loyalty and devotion, and not merely with spasmodic loyalty, giving no certainty of reliance or support; that if men bolt to a minor party it is but to "vote in the air," or "to throw away your vote," or to give a half vote to the enemy; and that to vote with the opposite party is, of course, "to turn the Government over to its enemies." All that is bad in one party is urged by the advocates of the other as reasons against independent voting.

These are the usual party pleas, and many of them have weight. The natural party disposition of most men is to give them full force and effect. But sensible party men who make these pleas do not themselves surrender the "divine right to bolt." They know the need of a reasonable measure of personal independence, and they recognize that throughout our party history such political independence has been a constant and powerful influence in determining the course of political events. The history of American parties is full of illustrations: Salmon P. Chase, Charles Sumner, George F. Hoar, George A. Boutwell, Henry Wilson, and others who, as young men, left their party for their cause in 1848; Lincoln, Seward, Trumbull, Colfax, and all who were in at the making of the Republican Party in 1854 and 1856, and who, for their cause, were ready to see their old parties defeated and shattered; Horace Greeley, Charles Francis Adams, Senator Depew, Whitelaw Reid, Murat Halstead, who, later in the history of the Republican Party, sought to bring it to defeat in 1872; Martin Van Buren, Samuel J. Tilden, David Dudley Field, William Cullen Bryant, among Democrats in 1848; Breckinridge in 1860; Cleveland and Hill and Palmer and others in 1896—all these renowned leaders and party managers among both the great parties have at times asserted their independence of party authority and have sought to compass their party's defeat. If party men by withstanding party authority are likely to lose influence with their party or weight in its councils (which is not always the case), it by no means follows that they weaken their influence over the course of events, or receive a more unfavorable judgment from history.

No absolute rule for determining one's relation to party can be laid down. It is a part of the universal conflict between freedom and authority, between individualism and social action. What one will do in such a matter will depend upon his circumstances; upon the merits of the situation; upon personal disposition; upon one's estimate of the value of the party; upon the intensity of one's interest, conviction, and purpose in reference to the public policies at issue.

It is obvious that men sometimes act independent of parties from good motives, sometimes from bad motives; sometimes from public interests, sometimes from personal and selfish interest; sometimes for a noble cause, sometimes for an ignoble cause. Recognizing party as a necessary or beneficial agency in popular government, if it be asked whether bolting is justifiable, it must be answered that it is not if the bolting is prompted by reasons that are trivial, petty, spiteful, selfish, ignoble; but that it is justifiable if the reasons given are good and sufficient. Who is to judge the reasons that are given? Manifestly the only reply is that every man must answer for himself to his own individual conscience and judgment. There is no other tribunal to which he can appeal. He may seek guidance and wisdom from experience, history, revelation, from whatever source he will, but if he is an intelligent, self-directing agent his action must be his own, and he alone is responsible. And he must stand or fall

before public sentiment and posterity—the court supreme to which he must be willing to submit his case—by the reasons that he gives. According to the judgment wherewith he judges shall he be judged.

It is certainly only reasonable independence for the voter to insist that party interest shall always be subordinated to the country's interest; that one should never unreservedly pledge himself to an unknown result of party action; that the party's principles in the opinion of the voter be designed to promote the public welfare and that the party should be faithful to its principles; and that when the party abandons its principles and fails to present faithful and fit candidates for offices it is not only the privilege but it is the duty of all good citizens to withhold their votes.

Let it be known that you are interested in the success of the party. Asking nothing for yourself, take a hand in shaping the party policy and making nominations, being guided by public interests rather than personal ones. If against your protests they make bad nominations, bolt them and return to the charge. Keep standing up for men and things that are honest and of good report.

Party is always to be subordinated to patriotism. Perfect party discipline is the most dangerous weapon of party spirit, for it is the abdication of individual judgment. It is for you to help break this withering spell. It is for you to assert the independence and the dignity of the individual citizen and to prove that the party was made for the voter and not the voter for the party. When you are angrily told that if you erect your personal whim against the regular party behest you make representative government impossible by refusing to accept its conditions, hold fast by your conscience and let the party go.

The services of party to liberty and popular government should be recognized. But when national interests are sacrificed or subordinated to personal interests parties degenerate into factions. As long as the party is bound together by a common attachment to principles and a supreme regard for the national welfare its existence is justified. When it becomes a machine for the dispensation of patronage it is a menace to the State.

Critics of democracy have imputed its failures and blunders and misgovernment in America, as seen especially in large cities, to the ignorant and the poor and to the evils of an unrestricted suffrage. The indictment is misplaced. Ignorance and poverty are but the prey, not the source, of political corruption. Its source is found farther up—in the commercialism of the rich and powerful classes, among the "respectable" and the "well-to-do," who look upon politics and the laws only as a means of private gain. Usually in the rank and file of the common people we find the intelligence and patriotism that are the saving forces of the State. They will not fail to deliver their parties and their party government from the control of the selfish and the venal. To this end the great need in American politics to-day is that young men of high ideals and resolute purposes for good government should devote themselves to political activity, standing up stoutly and constantly for honest government, high ideals in politics, and that active participation in political life by which better government is brought to pass. This is a path to honor and to the highest service, and it may be a path to national fame. For our political history shows that it is the men who have these high standards of integrity and ideals of public service whom the vicissitudes of politics and party struggles bring into leadership and into the highest honor and office in the gift of the people.

POLITICAL CROSS PUZZLES

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, in view of the cross-history puzzle of the Republican Party in recent years, I am sure that the majority members of the recent caucus, held on November 28, will find it very difficult to harmonize their present and past attitudes toward certain members of the party. It is a very easy matter to take a crooked position on any question, but it is a very, very difficult matter to make it appear right to the people, and before they are through adjusting themselves to the situation their fate may be similar to that of the Scotchman's chameleon which killed itself trying to adjust itself to the different colors of the Scotch plaid on which it was placed.

A STATESMAN'S VOICE

Mr. President, I wish now to quote the utterances of the greatest Roman of them all, the Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, the present Secretary of State, from a statement made while he was Governor of New York. Secretary Hughes is a man who lives up to the truths he teaches. He believes in example as well as precept, as evidenced by his attitude in support of the fusion candidate for mayor of the city of New York against the nominee of his own party. In the utterances referred to he certainly voiced the sentiment of all 100 per cent Americans in the following language:

Party loyalty and patriotism should coincide. But if they are antagonistic, patriotism must ever be supreme. The party is not the Nation or State. When the attitude of party threatens the interest of the community, when ill-chosen policy invites general disaster,

when party success means the debasement of standards of honor and decency, the party man should recognize the superior obligation of his citizenship.

MY CONSTITUENTS THE JUDGES

Mr. President, I hold no brief for the other three Senators who have been included in the resolution of exclusion. I simply wish to say that I am proud of their friendship and feel it an honor to have had the privilege of toiling and working with them in the interests of the common people of this land. They are all great and honorable men and competent to present their own case to the public, and I am sure that they will do so when in their judgment the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. President, if the judgment of the majority members of the caucus is to prevail in the councils of the party, I am sure that in 1926 the party will be figuring on how to get somebody into it harder than the arrogant would-be leaders are now scheming to get certain Senators out of it.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, it matters little to me whether the Republican caucus or the United States Senate supports or repudiates the resolution adopted by the caucus of November 28, 1924. If I am wrong in the position I have taken, it will profit me nothing, even though I were showered with their praises. If I am right, I am sure in the end to triumph in spite of all the resolutions of exclusion and votes of censorship of any caucus or political party which may be enjoying temporary authority through right of misrepresentation may pass.

Let no one think I am making any personal appeal. I do not acknowledge any default for myself nor do I recognize any jurisdiction that can hold me to account, except that of my constituents. I owe no allegiance to the people who seem to function as the Republican Party in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Missouri, or Pennsylvania, aside from the obligations of citizenship in a common country.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, perhaps after my vote a few moments ago I can hardly qualify even to reply briefly to the Senator from North Dakota, for, if differing with the administration at times on settlement of current issues would mean expulsion from the party, then undoubtedly I occupy that position, but I have never considered party responsibility to go that far or I am afraid few could qualify. It is fortunate, in my judgment, that Senators of a party do at times disagree on details and policies in legislative matters in order, through such disagreement, to bring out the very best thought and insure efficient and effective compromises. However, I did not rise to qualify my own position. The Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that subject—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator leaves the subject of the test of party loyalty will he state to the Senator from Idaho and other Senators what is the test?

Mr. EDGE. Well, Mr. President, I do not know that I am an authority, but I will give the Senator, without the slightest hesitation, my personal conviction in that regard. As I started to say when interrupted, I did not take the floor with any desire of qualifying my own position as to party loyalty but rather to reply in part to some of the suggestions made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Yes; I was somewhat active in the conference which voted, fairly overwhelmingly as I recall, that under existing conditions four Senators were hardly qualified as Republicans. I have not in the slightest degree changed my viewpoint.

The Senator from North Dakota offers as an illustration occurrences in connection with the Roosevelt split. He mentioned various prominent Roosevelt Republicans who are now occupying or who occupied following that defection very important positions in the Republican Party. I rather gathered as he went along that he was using that illustration as a bid to reenter in full membership the Republican Party, as the Republicans were glad to have the so-called Bull Moosers reenter the Republican Party. Yes; hundreds of thousands of them came back to the Republican Party and are to-day in all sections of the country, and very properly so, holding important positions of authority and responsibility and influence in the party. Further—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. Let me finish my thought and I will be glad to be interrupted. Further than that those same men, thousands of them, have taken part in Republican national conventions, have helped to formulate the national platforms, have sub-

scribed to those platforms, and helped to elect the nominees of those conventions. I do not think further explanation is necessary. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota fully understands the distinction and the difference.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. In the Roosevelt cases, to which the Senator refers, there was not any action by any Republican committee or organization. In this case, in which the Senator says he was active, there was some action. Now, assuming for the sake of the argument that the action of the caucus put these Senators out of the party, how would they get back in if they wanted to? Would it take further action by this same alleged official body to let them come back? Could they come back as the Roosevelt fellows came back?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the Senator has answered his own question.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. One at a time.

Mr. BORAH. Is it not true that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] had come back? He was in the caucus, was he not?

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator from North Dakota has come back, and is entirely satisfied, his speech certainly was no evidence of it, as the Senator would know if he had heard the speech just delivered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BORAH. But the speech has taken place since he was thrown out. At the time he was back in the caucus.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator from North Dakota had evidenced in the slightest degree, on that occasion or since, his desire—as I believe the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] very quickly did on the other side of the Chamber—to be a part of the Republican Party giving every member a perfect right, as I have taken the right in the last few hours, to differ with the administration on detail matters, I do not think there would have been very much difficulty about the position of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, now—

Mr. EDGE. Just a moment. I want to finish my thought. The Senator can have the floor in his own time.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to get answers to some questions.

Mr. EDGE. I will give the Senator an answer to any question if he will give me time.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I will ask one right now. The Senator says that if the Senator from North Dakota, who was present when he was thrown over the transom, had shown any disposition to repent, he would have been taken back.

Mr. EDGE. I said I assumed that he would.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator speak officially?

Mr. EDGE. No.

Mr. NORRIS. There might be some other member of that caucus who would have felt differently about it.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator is not asking a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I am asking this question: I am trying to have the Senator tell where lies the authority to take the action that was taken.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator is doing just exactly what I assumed he would do. He is simply, in his very clever way, endeavoring to becloud the issue. The Senator from North Dakota answered the question himself. In case the Senator from Nebraska did not follow the speech which has just been delivered by the Senator from North Dakota, I am sure that if he will read it later he will find it to be a very positive statement of that Senator's creed and viewpoint, which, as I followed it—I did not hear it all—differs widely from the policy of the Republican Party as adopted by a national convention through a national platform.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is the Senator's idea; but does the Senator assume to speak for the Republican Party? If he does, how does he explain his action to-day?

Mr. EDGE. No; I do not assume to speak for the Republican Party; but about 7,000,000 people in the country, a popular majority, spoke for the candidates of the Republican Party in November last.

Mr. NORRIS. And the Senator went against his party leader this very afternoon.

Mr. EDGE. And I frequently will in matters of detail, if my judgment differs from his.

Mr. NORRIS. Well—

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I am not going to engage in a controversy. The Senator from Nebraska knows full well the distinction and the difference. He is simply, as I have said before, attempting to confuse the issue. The difference is this, and no man knows it better than the Senator from Nebraska: The national platform of a party, referring to gen-

eral policies, of course, should be, in my judgment, adhered to by persons who claim membership in that party.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. EDGE. Not for the moment.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. The difference lies in matters of detail, in feelings of expediency, in methods pursued to bring about a reform. These are matters on which any Senator at any time, or any citizen at any time, has a perfect right and a proper right to use his own judgment.

As I said at the outset, I did not take the floor to defend my own position at all. My own position has been clearly enunciated to the Senate and to the country, and I shall always assume full personal responsibility for any position that I may take on details in considering any large or small public question.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. EDGE. Oh, yes; I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to ask, as I asked in the beginning, what is the test of loyalty? The Senator to-day has voted against the nominal leader of the party, now the actual leader. He has voted against the platform. Now, what is the test of loyalty?

Mr. EDGE. No; the Senator from New Jersey disagrees with the statement that he voted against the platform. I do not recall anything in the national platform which in any way controls the viewpoint of a Senator on the question of postal salaries or the method to be pursued to bring about an increase in those salaries.

Mr. BORAH. Let us recall the history of it. The bill which we passed upon to-day, by passing upon the veto, passed at the last session. The President vetoed it. That veto was standing during the election. The President went on record against this particular measure and had incorporated in the platform a declaration for economy, one item of which was this particular measure. After the election is over and the President has been indorsed by a considerable majority and the platform has been approved the Senator from New Jersey claims the right to vote both against the leader of the party and the platform as construed by the leader of the party time and time again in the campaign. Now, then, I ask, what is the test of loyalty?

Mr. EDGE. The Senator from New Jersey not only claims that right at this time, but he claimed the right all through the preprimary period and during the primary campaign so far as it related to the postal bill.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] did in the campaign. He claimed the right to express his views, which were in contradistinction to the views of the President.

Mr. EDGE. Oh, no, Mr. President; that is begging the issue, and I can not permit such a thought to remain for a moment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. The Senator from North Dakota supported for President a man who was running against the nominee of the Republican National Convention. The Senator from North Dakota, on the stump, as I recall, endeavored to elect a man who, if elected, would of course have destroyed the Republican Party. The Senator from New Jersey did nothing of the kind. There is quite a distinction.

Mr. BORAH. In other words, it is perfectly loyal—

Mr. EDGE. Just a moment. There is quite a distinction, and as far as I am concerned a distinction which can not be misunderstood, that of giving loyal support to the regular nominees of a national convention, with representatives of the party present from every State in the Union, and a difference in detail on this or that particular issue, especially when in the campaign I took my position clearly and plainly on that issue. The Senator from Idaho, with all his power and all his force and usually his fairness, can not make a parallel case of the position of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] in supporting LaFollette and Wheeler, and the position of a Senator who might differ with the President on an economic issue during the campaign, and so stated his position.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want to be unfair, of course; but I do want to get, if I can, the standard of loyalty in this situation. As I understand it now, it is that of supporting the ticket during the campaign.

Mr. EDGE. That is one of the standards; yes one of the most important standards.

Mr. BORAH. But it does not involve supporting the party in its measures and issues after the campaign has closed?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, it does so far as major issues are concerned.

Mr. BORAH. But if—

Mr. EDGE. Just a moment, now; I am going to answer the Senator's question. Take for instance, the question of the World Court. Take, for instance, the question of ratification of the League of Nations four or five years ago, in which the Senator from Idaho and myself took a part. Senators on both sides differed materially on those great questions. They differed materially because, I imagine, in part—I know I felt that way; I can not speak for other Senators—there was nothing in the platform of either party that held us down to any particular decision on those great international questions. So it would be, of course, with a matter of postal revenue. Who could say that a man was traitorous to his party because he believed that a postal increase should be established at this time, after a vote of 73 to 3, rather than perhaps 8 or 10 or 12 months later?

The two illustrations are in no way parallel. When the Senator asks, as I understood him, whether the question of loyalty rests upon support of the national candidates, I say yes, that unquestionably; there can not be two views as to that.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand loyalty is supporting a candidate to get him and defeating him after you give him power?

Mr. EDGE. I differ entirely with that deduction, and I am quite sure a large majority of my colleagues would take the same position.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose so.

Mr. EDGE. I am glad I have helped to invite general discussion of this character. I am glad to have had the opportunity of taking part in it. It seems, as I view it, that the Senate of the United States is very much more concerned than is the public of the United States in these family quarrels. We have had on the other side of the Chamber almost daily, ever since the Senate convened, a little rubbing up and washing of linen, as it were, at times very acrimonious.

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. Just a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. I have not yielded. We have had quite a little of it, and it has been regaling and very entertaining, and we have all enjoyed it. To-day, for the first time, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] has risen, representing the quartet who were rather positively and emphatically given to understand that their support of rival candidates to our nominees was not in harmony with party regularity, and thus invited the action taken. I am glad the explanation has been made. I am very glad to have had the opportunity of listening to it. I am glad the position of the Senator from North Dakota is more clearly defined. We had our say on November 28, or whatever day it was. It is perfectly proper for the Senator from North Dakota to have his say to-day.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. I welcome the Senator back to the Republican Party, if the illustrations—

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no, no!

Mr. EDGE. Just a moment. If the illustrations which he so plaintively gave us of the way in which the Roosevelt Bull Moosers were brought back and welcomed to the party is an illustration of his state of mind, I am sure that it will be demonstrated by actions which will follow in the days and weeks to come; and when he has properly qualified, without speaking with authority, I am sure the Republican caucus will be glad to welcome him back and forget that he has been wayward or misguided.

Mr. NORRIS. Now will be Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. I yield the floor.

MUSCLE SHOALS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam-power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17, on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a

corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. McKELLAR. May the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2 of the Underwood substitute, on lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace," and to insert in lieu thereof the following words:

and for the production and sale in time of peace of nitrogen and surplus electric power created at said plants.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

Mr. BRUCE. I have not called for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The demand is not seconded. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Interior Department appropriation bill is before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I was about to ask that the bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, be laid before the Senate, but I understand from the Chair that it is before the Senate under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary, salaries," on page 2, line 17, after the word "grade" to insert "unless in unusually meritorious cases the President shall otherwise direct," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "the classification act of 1923," the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade unless in unusually meritorious cases the President shall otherwise direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," on page 4, at the end of

line 24, to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$92,000," and on page 5, at the end of line 2, to insert "contingent expenses, offices of surveyors general, \$2,000," so as to read:

For stationery, including tags, labels, index cards, cloth-lined wrappers, and specimen bags, printed in the course of manufacture, and such printed envelopes as are not supplied under contracts made by the Postmaster General, for the department and its several bureaus and offices, \$73,000; and, in addition thereto, sums amounting to \$92,000 shall be deducted from other appropriations made for the fiscal year 1926, as follows: Surveying public lands, \$3,500; protecting public lands and timber, \$2,000; contingent expenses, offices of surveyors general, \$2,000; contingent expenses local land offices, \$3,500; Geological Survey, \$2,000; Bureau of Mines, \$17,000; Indian Service, \$35,000; Freedmen's Hospital, \$500; St. Elizabeths Hospital, \$3,500; National Park Service, \$5,000; Bureau of Reclamation, \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, General Land Office," on page 9, line 3, after the word "offices," to insert "of United States surveyors general and other offices," so as to make the paragraph read:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, at not exceeding \$4, of examiners and of clerks detailed to inspect offices of United States surveyors general and other offices in the Public Land Service, to investigate fraudulent land entries, trespasses on the public lands, and cases of official misconduct, actual necessary expenses of transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, and for employment of stenographers and other assistants when necessary to the efficient conduct of examinations, and when authorized by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 23, to strike out:

The office of surveyor general is hereby abolished, effective July 1, 1925, and the administration of all activities theretofore in charge of surveyors general, including the necessary personnel, all records, furniture, and other equipment, and all supplies of their respective offices, are hereby transferred to and consolidated with the field surveying service, under the jurisdiction of the United States supervisor of surveys, who shall hereafter administer same in association with the surveying operations in his charge and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 9, to insert:

Surveyors general: For salaries of surveyors general, including the surveyor general and ex officio secretary of the Territory of Alaska, \$40,700; for clerks in their offices, \$164,720; and for contingent expenses, including office rent, pay of messengers, stationery, drafting instruments, typewriters, furniture, fuel, lights, books of reference for office use, post-office box rent, and other incidental expenses, including the exchange of typewriters, \$9,260; in all, \$214,680.

Expenses chargeable to the foregoing appropriations for clerk hire and incidental expenses in the offices of the surveyors general shall not be incurred by the respective surveyors general in the conduct of said offices, except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail temporarily clerks from the office of one surveyor general to another as the necessities of the service may require and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands. A detailed statement of traveling expenses incurred hereunder shall be made to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof.

The use of the fund created by the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. p. 937), for office work in the surveyors general's offices is extended for one year from June 30, 1925: *Provided, That not to exceed \$5,000 of this fund shall be used for the purposes above indicated.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$840,290" and insert "\$792,820," so as to read:

Surveying public lands: For surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, making fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$792,820.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether the usual rule has been adopted that amendments may not be offered until after committee amendments are considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed that committee amendments should be considered first. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after the word "each," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$175,000"; in line 2, after the word "such," to strike out "of the following"; and in line 6, after the word "consolidations," to strike out the colon and the words: "Montgomery, Ala.; Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome, Alaska; Phoenix, Ariz.; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, and Visalia, Calif.; Denver, Glenwood Springs, Montrose, and Pueblo, Colo.; Gainesville, Fla.; Boise and Lewiston, Idaho; Baton Rouge, La.; Marquette, Mich.; Cass Lake, Minn.; Havre, Helena, Miles City, and Missoula, Mont.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Carson City, Nev.; Las Cruces, Roswell, and Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Guthrie, Okla.; Lakeview, Portland, Roseburg, The Dalles, and Vale, Oreg.; Pierre and Rapid City, S. Dak.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Seattle and Spokane, Wash.; and Buffalo, Douglas, Evanston, and Lander, Wyo.," so as to read:

Registers: For salaries and commissions of registers of district land offices, at not exceeding \$3,000 per annum each, \$175,000: *Provided*, That the offices of register and receiver of such land offices as may now have two officials shall be consolidated, effective July 1, 1925, and the applicable provisions of the act approved October 28, 1921, shall be followed in effecting such consolidations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], in charge of the bill, a question. What is the effect of the amendment which the committee have reported on page 13?

Mr. SMOOT. The effect of the amendment is that it will leave the law just as it is. It authorizes the President of the United States to abolish any of these offices that he sees fit under provisions of existing law. The Senator will notice that we increase the amount from \$125,000 to \$175,000 appropriated for offices, and that will require the President of the United States to abolish certain offices which he may choose to select.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senate committee proposes to increase in the sum of \$50,000 the appropriation as made by the House?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; \$50,000. I will say to the Senator that all the western Senators thought that was the proper thing to do.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Indian lands," on page 23, after line 19, to insert:

For payment of certain local taxes to the counties of Stevens and Ferry, in the State of Washington, on allotted Colville Indian lands, as provided by the act of June 7, 1924, \$115,767.67.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like some explanation in regard to the item just read. My recollection is that heretofore it has been the subject of some inquiry, if not some legislation, by Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to my colleague that on June 7, 1924, an act was approved by the President, having passed this body at the last session of Congress and passed the House, authorizing the payment of this amount for taxes on the land. This provision is simply to carry out the law that is on the statute books to-day.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of my colleague whether this means that the Indian lands or lands owned by the Government may be subject to municipal or State taxation and that we must make an appropriation to pay State taxes that may be levied against Government property or Indian property?

Mr. SMOOT. Under the same conditions by which these taxes were assessed in the State of Washington, it would be assessable.

Mr. KING. I would like a little more light on the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. I judge from his question that the Senator wants to understand the item. The item is not intended to make the Government pay taxes on those lands in the various counties. In this instance the Government took certain lands which had been set aside under Executive order and they were sold.

Mr. KING. Indian lands?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; Indian lands. They were sold and the money was put in the Treasury, but it was contended that the Indians were not entitled to it. It was afterwards decided by the court that the Indians were entitled to the money, and so the money was paid over to them. There was an agreement in the provision that if the lands were taxed, certain amounts should be deducted from the fund. Those lands were taxed, but the money in the meantime had been

turned over to the Indians and there was no money with which to pay the taxes, so a bill was introduced at the last session of Congress, as there had been at a previous session or two, and it was finally passed, authorizing the Government to pay the back taxes which became due under the agreement away back in 1894 or 1895.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether the State is still insisting upon the taxes?

Mr. CURTIS. It is insisting upon these taxes because they were levied at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I inquire of the Senator whether the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] protested against the inclusion of this item in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. He did not.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask whether the tax was levied while these lands were Indian lands and not Government lands? Was the assessment made while the lands were in the hands of the Government? If so, that would be an illegal assessment.

Mr. CURTIS. It was after the lands had been opened up and while they belonged to the Indians. There was an agreement that the taxes, if paid, should be deducted from this fund, but, as I said, the fund was paid over to the Indians under a decision of the court.

Mr. FLETCHER. What puzzles me is whether the lands were Government lands when they were taxed.

Mr. CURTIS. They were not Government lands when they were taxed.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I think I can make the point clear. I introduced the bill which was passed through the Senate concerning this matter. The money originally in the Treasury under a provision of law was to be set apart to be used for the building of schools and other purposes, among them being the payment of taxes on Indian lands. It is based on the only law that contained such a provision in connection with the opening of Indian reservations.

In 1915, I think it was, the Comptroller General, without authority of law, as we believe and as the committee which investigated believed, covered this money into the Treasury by his decision, and yet in fact the money is still "set apart." \$265,000 remaining. The Comptroller General simply took the money on his own authority, as we contend, and put it in the Treasury. Therefore we have no fund out of which to pay the taxes, but under the law of 1892 this money, which was received for these Indian lands, was specifically provided to be used for different purposes, one of which was the payment of the taxes here referred to.

Mr. FLETCHER. But I understood the Senator from Kansas to say that all of the money which the Government received had been paid over to the Indians.

Mr. CURTIS. There was a decision to the effect that the Indians were entitled to the money and the money was paid to the Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. And it left a claim against the Government which was afterwards paid under an act of Congress.

The taxes were not levied while the land was still held by the Indians as a reservation. It was opened up for settlement, and the Representative in Congress at that time from the district contended that as it was an Executive-order reservation the money should not go to the Indians.

I remember I was on the Committee on Indian Affairs and took the opposite ground and contended that the money should go to the Indians. The original act was passed in 1892, and when I became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1893 the question again came up, and there was a controversy regarding it. At the time I contended that the money belonged to the Indians. Mr. Wilson, of Washington, contended that it did not belong to the Indians because the reservation was established by an Executive order.

After the land was set aside and put up for sale, it was agreed that the taxes levied should be paid out of the money realized from that source, as the Senator from Washington has stated, and also that schoolhouses should be built, and so forth. When the decision was made that the Indians were entitled to the money, it was all paid over to the Indians, and there was no money left with which to pay the taxes. Subsequently a private bill bearing on the subject was introduced by the Senator who is now in the chair [Mr. JONES of Washington], and afterwards I think a similar bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Washington. At any rate, such a bill was reported a number of times from the committee, and at last it passed Congress, authorizing the payment of this money. That is the cause of this item being put into the appropriation bill at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. The substance of the matter is, then, that the Government, by having issued the Executive order and taken over the land, is thereby out of pocket this \$115,767.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator is mistaken. I think the Government is out of pocket because of the mistake that was made in the act of Congress trying to tax the land and holding that the land did not belong to the Indians.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the lands have since been sold and are now held subject to this assessment?

Mr. CURTIS. They were sold away back in the nineties.

Mr. DILL. What the Senator from Kansas has stated is true, with the exception that certain moneys have been paid in since the time of which the Senator speaks. From about 1906 to 1917 some \$265,000 were paid in.

Mr. CURTIS. I knew nothing of that.

Mr. DILL. That is what I was trying to explain. The Senator's statement is true as to the original \$122,000, but some \$265,000 was later paid in. I might read the Senator this letter which was written—

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the \$115,767 come out of the \$266,000?

Mr. DILL. This \$266,000 was in the Treasury of the United States under the law which set it apart to be used for certain purposes for this Indian tribe. In 1915 the Comptroller General attempted to and, as he states, did cover this money into the Treasury of the United States. I believe, and I think the committee believe, that he had no right to do it, and that, in effect, the character of the fund was not changed from what the law contemplated, namely, that it should be a set-apart fund. Consequently we have no fund, although that money, amounting to \$266,000, has been put into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of some Senator how those lands ever came to be taxable at all; in other words, how did the authorities of the State of Washington ever have any claim whatever against those lands?

Mr. DILL. Because of the provisions of the act under which the reservation was opened. I think it will be interesting if I should read the letter which I hold in my hand from Mr. Burke, the then Commissioner of Indian Affairs, written to Representative HILL, from the district where these lands are located. If the Senator will permit me, I will read the letter. It is not very long. This letter was written only recently; there is no date given on the letter, but it was written within the last month. It is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. HILL: Referring to your informal inquiry this date regarding the amount of the special fund credited to the Colville Indians on account of the disposal of lands within the north half of the Colville Reservation in the State of Washington, prior to the act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 377), and the disposition made thereof, the records of the office show a total receipt of \$122,034.37 carried under the title, "Proceeds of Colville Reservation, Wash."

From this amount there was expended for beneficial purposes, including purchase of cattle, \$63,795.43 reimbursed to the United States on account of the expenditures from reimbursable appropriations for surveying and allotting work on the Colville Reservation, \$54,518.91, and repaid to purchasers on account of the lands erroneously sold, \$2,422.72, or a total of \$120,737.06, leaving a balance in the Treasury this date of \$1,297.31.

Regarding your inquiry as to the receipts credited subsequent to the act of June 21, 1906, supra, and the disposal thereof, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office submitted August 27, 1915, shows that the aggregate receipts from June 21, 1906, to August 20, 1915, amounted to \$273,448.94. From this amount there was repaid to purchasers on account of lands erroneously sold the sum of \$7,858.07, and the balance, namely, \$265,590.87, credited in the Treasury of the United States as public funds under the heading "Sale of public lands." Reference thereto may be made by auditor's certificate No. 47412, dated December 29, 1915.

That explains this fund. In another letter he explains that this money is in a set-apart fund and has been covered into the Treasury by action of the Comptroller General.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a question?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. As I understand, the act of June 7, 1924, required the payment of this fund.

Mr. DILL. Exactly.

Mr. ROBINSON. So that unless Congress is going to pay it, it will be necessary to repeal the act of June 7, 1924.

Mr. DILL. I may say to the Senator that this whole matter was gone into first by a committee of the Senate when the

senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] secured consideration of a bill some years before I became a Member of the Senate, and that bill was passed by the Senate. At the last session of Congress the House committee went into it very thoroughly and recommended that the bill be passed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course the object of passing the statute to which I have just referred and to which the Senator from Washington also refers was to determine the question of authorization. That statute settles that question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator, of course, is quite right about that, and the Budget Bureau, and perhaps the committee of the Senate, were acting entirely correctly in recommending this appropriation, but if the bill was passed on the 7th of last June unreflectingly and ought to be repealed, it seems to me it would be quite proper for us to withhold the appropriation until that matter shall have been considered.

Mr. ROBINSON. I did not understand that anybody had suggested a repeal of the statute.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would certainly suggest it if there never was any just foundation for the claim, and I have never yet learned how it was that the authorities of the State of Washington ever got a right or even now have a right, except as it is conferred by the act referred to, to get \$115,767 out of the United States Treasury on account of taxes they claim to have imposed upon Indian land. If so, I am going to advise the Legislature of Montana to proceed to tax Indian lands in the State of Montana.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Washington has explained that under the terms of the statute opening up the reservation this obligation to pay taxes arose.

Mr. DILL. Let me read the statute.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Government by Executive order took the lands over, that still did not make them subject to taxation.

Mr. DILL. Let me read to the Senator from the act of July 1, 1892. After referring to the sale of the lands, it says:

That the net proceeds arising from the sale and disposition of the lands to be so opened to entry and settlement shall be set apart in the Treasury of the United States for the time being, but subject to such future appropriation for public use as Congress may make, and that until so otherwise appropriated may be subject to expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, in such amounts as he shall deem best—

I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to what follows, as it bears on the very question about which he has been asking—

in the building of schoolhouses, the maintenance of schools for such Indians, for the payment of such part of the local taxation as may be properly applied to the lands allotted to such Indians, as he shall think fit, so long as such allotted lands shall be held in trust and exempt from taxation, and in such other ways as he may deem proper for the promotion of education, civilization, and self-support among the Indians.

What I am calling attention to is that the act of 1892 is the only act opening any Indian reservation in the United States which provided that funds received for the land may be used to pay the local taxes of the State where those lands are situated.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But obviously, Mr. President, that means taxes that are legally imposed.

Mr. DILL. They were legally imposed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But how were they legally imposed if the lands were the lands of the United States?

Mr. DILL. Because under this law the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to pay the taxes on these lands.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We are arguing in a circle. The act provides that a certain part of the fund shall be applied to the payment of local taxation. Of course, that is local taxes that are legally assessed and levied; and if there never was any legality for them, then there is nothing to pay.

Mr. DILL. They were legal so far as they could be legal.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I agree to that; but when the law says that this money shall be set aside to pay taxes on Indian lands that are exempt, how does it make them legal?

Mr. JONES of Washington (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Let me call the Senator's attention to this particular language in what my colleague has just read:

That the net proceeds * * * shall be set apart * * * for the payment of such part of the local taxation as may be properly applied to the lands allotted to such Indians as he shall think fit, so long as such allotted lands shall be held in trust and exempt from taxation.

That is the express language of the law. As I think my colleague has already said, this is a peculiar provision. It is found in no other act relating to any other reservation, but because of the peculiar conditions there Congress saw fit to place that provision in the law.

Mr. FLETCHER. Might not that have reference to the drainage taxes or taxes for improving the land or to other special taxes?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There was no drainage proposition involved in connection with this reservation at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. Might it not refer to any kind of improvement that might be made on the land which would ordinarily become a lien on the land?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it had no connection with anything of that kind. Let me suggest, too, that this claim has been passed upon by Congress, and in the act of 1920 we put in a provision for a special investigation and a report in regard to this claim, and pursuant to that direction an investigation was made by the department, and the department made a recommendation on account of the various conditions that they found existing in connection with that reservation. There are two or three pages of the report which I might read which show that they felt that the claim of these two counties in this respect should be met, and they recommend it to Congress. Then, as I have said, we passed the act of 1924 after it had previously passed the Senate, I think, twice if not three times, and been reported to the House twice.

Mr. ROBINSON. An examination of the subject was made pursuant to the action of Congress by the department and a report was submitted, and then the Congress passed on that report and enacted the statute requiring the payment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. So I think the case is as complete as it can be.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire of the Senator if the exempt period was the usual trust period of 25 years?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So for 25 years the Government of the United States was called upon to pay the ratable proportion of the local taxes?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may have been so, except that we passed a subsequent act under which we required the homestead settler to pay \$1.50 an acre. These lands were open to settlement, and the homesteaders had to pay \$1.50 an acre in addition to complying with the homestead law. Then we entered into an agreement to pay the Indians \$1,500,000 and ended the trust period.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How long did the statute of 1892 operate, and how long did the United States continue to pay taxes on these Indian lands?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think for four or five years.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would bring it to 1897.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; they did not begin back there. The claim of the counties began in 1906, I think, or 1910.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then what happened between 1892 and 1906? The Government of the United States apparently was obligated to pay the taxes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not for all that time. I do not remember just the particular provisions. According to my recollection, the ceded land was not opened to homestead entry until April 10, 1900, by proclamation of the President. The act was passed in 1892, and then another act was passed in 1906. As I say, the Interior Department went into all these matters. I can not take the time to read the entire report. They investigated all these matters and reported to Congress and recommended that this be done.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What it amounts to is that the Government of the United States agreed to pay taxes on those Indian lands to the local authorities?

Mr. DILL. Out of the moneys that came from the lands that were sold.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; from the lands that were sold, and the United States paid a part of the money derived from the lands that were sold to the settlers to the local authorities for taxes upon the lands that were set aside for the Indians; that is, taxes on the Indian lands.

Mr. DILL. That is the provision of the law of 1892.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That was the express provision of the statute. This is simply carrying out that law.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Government still has that fund to the credit of the public lands?

Mr. DILL. I tried to explain to the Senator that under the law it was to be set apart in the Treasury, but under the decl-

sion of the Comptroller General in 1915 he simply took on himself the power and covered it into the Treasury, so that it is no longer credited on the books of the Treasury as a separate fund; but in fact, according to the letter of Mr. Burke which I read to the Senator, there was covered into the Treasury in that way \$266,000 of these moneys part of which the law of 1892 provided should be used to pay these local taxes.

Mr. FLETCHER. So that this \$115,000 might be considered as deducted from the \$266,000?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. That clears it up in my mind, Mr. President.

I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill one question with regard to the preceding paragraph, in line 12. I am addressing my remarks to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who has charge of the bill.

For the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California, including improvements thereon, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, \$7,000.

What do I understand is meant by the term "homeless Indians"? Are they Indians who belong to no tribe?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that they have no particular tribe. They have no particular place. We have a very few of them in Utah, down in the southeastern part of the State.

Mr. FLETCHER. Somewhat like our Seminoles of Florida?

Mr. SMOOT. Just about the same.

Mr. FLETCHER. They belong to no particular tribe, and are not really in the care of the Government in any way, as far as any legal obligation is concerned?

Mr. SMOOT. As far as our Indians are concerned, we have had an appropriation now and then for them, about the same as this.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wanted to understand that, because I was not quite clear what was meant by the term "homeless Indians in California." I supposed that all the Indians out there belonged to some tribe.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, your committee, in adopting this amendment and submitting it to the Senate, did so because of the fact that Congress had acted, Congress made this law, Congress authorized the payment of this money; and in submitting the amendment your committee felt that it was virtually a direction to pay this money, because of the fact that Congress had directed it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not questioning the propriety of the committee's action in reporting this amendment. I should like, however, to ask the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] a question or two, because, notwithstanding the very lucid and illuminating expositions of these questions, I am still in considerable doubt.

First, I should like to ask the Senator whether these lands, going back to the date of taxation, were Indian lands or private lands? When I say "private lands" I mean owned by white settlers and subject to taxation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. These lands in part of the Colville Indian Reservation were originally set aside by Executive order as a reservation.

Mr. KING. That is, they were public lands?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were public lands.

Mr. KING. Set aside for the Indians?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Set aside for the Indians; but in 1892 we passed an act providing for the disposition of these lands, under which the settlers were to pay \$1.50 an acre, and take up the lands and homestead them. That was on the theory, I think, of extinguishing the title.

Mr. KING. Was that \$1.50 to go to the Indians?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That \$1.50 was to go to the Indians; yes.

Mr. KING. And that constitutes the trust fund to which reference has been made?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that constituted the trust fund. Then, afterwards, the Indians were paid for the north half \$1,500,000, and those lands were restored to the public domain.

Mr. KING. Is it that tract that is taxed?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is the lands that were allotted to certain Indians out of that tract for which these taxes are taken; not the whole reservation.

Mr. KING. Did they cease to be within the tribal status and become settlers?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. KING. They are still wards of the Government?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those Indians are still on an Indian reservation, still an Indian tribe, but they have their allotments.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator—and I hope I shall be pardoned if I have made a mistake in following his statement—there were public lands within the State, and an Executive order set aside these lands, segregated them from the public domain, and set them aside for occupancy by the Indians. Thereupon some of the lands were sold to private persons at \$1.50 an acre, and the receipts derived therefrom constituted a trust fund; but the lands which were allotted to the Indians were taxed under authority from Congress, and now we are proposing to pay to the county the taxes which were levied upon lands owned by the Indians?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; these lands were not taxed.

Mr. KING. The Senator said they were, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the Senator misunderstood me. I did not mean to say that these lands were taxed.

Mr. KING. Then I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But they were lands allotted to the Indians. The other lands were restored to the public domain. Then, in the act of 1892, here is the express language that we put in on which the counties base their claim. We restored these 1,500,000 acres to the public domain, but there were part of these lands that had been allotted to the Indians.

Mr. KING. Pardon me. How could they be restored to the public domain if they had been allotted to the Indians?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The allotted part, of course, was not restored, but I refer to those that had not been allotted.

The claims of Stevens and Ferry Counties are based on the act of July 1, 1892 (27 Stat. L. 62), which act provided that the net proceeds arising from the sale of the north half of the Colville Reservation, in these counties, containing approximately 1,500,000 acres of land, ceded by the Indians and restored to the public domain, should be—

"Sec. 2. * * * set apart in the Treasury of the United States for the time being, but subject to such further appropriation for public use as Congress may make, and that until so otherwise appropriated may be subject to expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time in such amounts as he shall deem best in the building of schoolhouses, the maintenance of schools for such Indians, for the payment of such part of the local taxation as may be properly applied to the lands allotted to such Indians"—

Not for all the lands, but for such parts as were allotted to the Indians—

"as he shall think fit, so long as such allotted lands shall be held in trust and exempt from taxation, and in such other ways as he may deem proper for the promotion of education, civilization, and self-support among said Indians."

It is under that provision of law that we passed that this claim is asserted, and upon investigation by the Interior Department found to be justified, and then, upon a consideration by Congress of two or three bills, twice passed by the Senate, the law of 1924.

Mr. KING. Then, after all, it goes back to the proposition that lands which belong to the Indians have been taxed under authority of Congress?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; not exactly. If they had been restored to the public domain and taken up by private parties, of course then they would have been subject to taxation.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The necessity for schoolhouses—and it was found in this investigation that the county has actually built schoolhouses that are being used by the Indians—and the building of roads on the reservation, of which the Indians get a great part of the benefit, are some of the considerations, I think, that led them to report favorably to this. Congress saw fit to provide, in opening this land to public settlement, that where a part of it had been allotted to Indians and therefore could not be opened to settlement and title pass and then become subject to taxation, as to such lands, so long as this money was not appropriated by Congress, the Secretary might use part of that money for the payment of local taxation. The lands were not in fact taxed, but it was considered, I suppose, as an equity that the county was entitled to because of these lands being within the boundaries of the county and not subject to local taxation.

Mr. KING. I think we are differing on a matter of terminology. I used the word "taxed," and we have been using that word in the discussion. As a matter of fact, the position is this: Because the county had made certain improvements, expending moneys which it had derived from taxation, and had

built schoolhouses, roads, and so forth, when these lands which belonged to the Indians were allotted to the Indians and thrown open to private persons it was deemed proper and equitable that somebody should pay the county for some of the money which it had expended?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under this peculiar language of the statute. I think the Senator has stated it about right.

Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. GEORGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KING. Just one moment. It seems to me very clear that this is a very bad precedent. We are really recognizing the duty, in some instances at least, of Congress to appropriate money to the various States and counties, to reimburse them for money which they may have expended upon lands occupied by the Indians.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I understand, there is no other reservation that is affected by law having this language in it, so that this will not be a precedent.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator from Utah that this is a bad precedent. When this land, originally set aside for the Indians, was returned to the public domain, it was undoubtedly on the theory that the Indians did not need it.

Mr. KING. That is not the land that was taxed.

Mr. PITTMAN. When it was returned to the public domain it could have been granted constitutionally to the State in toto if they saw fit, or the Government could open it to homesteaders and distribute that money entirely to the State if they saw fit, or they could distribute a part of that money to the Indians and a part of it to the State, as they saw fit. What they actually did was this:

There was a part of that land not required for the Indians. It was restored to the public domain. In restoring it to the public domain they desired to reserve some of the benefits for the Indians. They provided that a part of the money derived from this land thereafter should go to the Indians for building schoolhouses, and so forth, and then they provided that a part of it should go to the counties and the State, measured by the amount of taxes that would have been paid if it had been in private ownership.

As a matter of fact, I think all of it should have gone to the State instead of the little portion of it that did go to the State. When you stop to think that 90 per cent of the land in some of the States out West to-day is public land and not subject to taxation, and that every means on earth is being used to keep it from going into private ownership, you should not object if a slight portion of the profits of the public land goes in to help pay taxes in those States, and that is all that this amounts to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was just going to make the suggestion that it seems to me this act of Congress might well have been construed as a consent by the Congress that this public non-taxable land might be considered subject to taxation. It is evidently on that basis that the claim was finally recognized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage," on page 30, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$130,000," so as to read:

In all, for irrigation on Indian reservations, not to exceed \$130,000, together with the unexpended balance of \$45,915.21 remaining from the appropriation of \$335,000 for such purposes in the act approved August 1, 1914, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L. p. 582):

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 14, after the word "For" to insert "continuing construction," and in line 18, after the word "property," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$45,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, by and under the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, including the purchase of any necessary rights or property, \$45,000 (reimbursable).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education," on page 41, line 24, after the word "for," to strike out "Indian youths" and insert "Indians," so as to read:

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of

their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, \$90,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$7,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indians and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 2, after the word "That," to strike out "where practicable the transportation and expenses of pupils," and insert "where practicable such transportation and expenses," so as to make the additional proviso read:

Provided further, That where practicable such transportation and expenses shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the word "where," which appears in this amendment on line 3, be changed to the word "when." The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was amended was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Just for information, may I inquire whether the \$2,445,000, under the head of "Education," line 4, page 40, is subtracted from, or is any portion taken from, the tribal funds which some of the tribes have in the Treasury of the United States, or is the entire appropriation taken from the Public Treasury?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is taken from the General Treasury, except where it is specifically provided that it shall be reimbursable, and that is generally the case where the Indians have the funds which can be used for that purpose.

Mr. KING. Would the general appropriation for education come from the tribal funds or from the General Treasury of the United States?

Mr. SMOOT. Under another heading, to which I had reference, this whole amount comes directly from the Treasury of the United States, being appropriated for the education of the Indians.

Mr. KING. Has that been the policy where the tribes have large amounts to their credit in the Treasury?

Mr. SMOOT. This is the practice that has been followed in making appropriations since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KING. I knew it was the policy many years ago, but I had understood that by reason of the very large holdings of some of the tribes appropriations were made from their tribal funds for all purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Appropriations of that character always are made reimbursable, but there are very few of them. This amount, however, is appropriated directly from the Treasury of the United States.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 12, after the word "buildings," to strike out "\$20,260" and insert "\$20,620," so as to read:

For the education of Osage children, including repairs to buildings, \$20,620, to be paid from the funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 69, line 4, after the words "chief engineer," to insert "and the director of reclamation economics," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no part of said appropriations may be used for maintenance of headquarters for the Bureau of Reclamation outside the District of Columbia except for the office of the chief engineer and the director of reclamation economics.

Mr. KING. Is there any law creating the office of director of reclamation economics, or has that been done by Executive order?

Mr. SMOOT. That is a position which exists in the Reclamation Service. It has always been there, and this amendment was put in because the bill provides that "no part of said appropriations may be used for maintenance of headquarters for the Bureau of Reclamation outside the District of Columbia, except for the office of the chief engineer." The director of reclamation economics does more work outside the District than the chief engineer does, and it costs no more than under existing law, but the bill does specifically state that part of the appropriation shall be expended for the director of reclamation economics, the same as for the chief engineer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 26, after the word "operations," to strike out "\$408,000" and insert "\$439,000," so as to read:

Boise project, Idaho: For operation and maintenance, continuance of construction, and incidental operations, \$439,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 6, after the word "thereof," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for investigations, examinations, surveys, or plans for or work upon any extension or extensions of this project," so as to read:

Provided, That the expenditure for drainage shall not exceed the amount paid by the water users pursuant to the provisions of the Boise public notice dated February 15, 1921, except for drainage in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 24, after the figures "\$611,000" to strike out the following provisos:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law, providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project, and the amount of the construction costs charged against each district shall be payable in annual installments, the first installment to be 5 per cent of the total charge and be due and payable on the 1st day of December of the third year following the date of said public notice, the remainder of the construction charge, with interest on deferred amounts from date of said public notice at 4 per cent per annum, to be amortized by payment on each December 1 thereafter of 5 per cent of said remainder for 40 years, or until the obligation is paid in full: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum provided for herein shall be expended for construction on account of any lands in private ownership until an appropriate repayment contract in accordance with the terms of this act and, in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall have been properly executed by a district organized under State law, embracing the lands in public or private ownership irrigable under the project, and the execution thereof shall have been confirmed by a decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, which contract, among other things, shall contain an appraisal approved by the Secretary of the Interior, showing the present actual bona fide value of all such irrigable lands, fixed without reference to the proposed construction, and shall provide that until one-half the construction charges against said lands shall have been fully paid no sale of any such lands shall be valid unless and until the purchase price involved in such sale is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall also provide that upon proof of fraudulent representation as to the true consideration involved in any such sale the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cancel the water right attaching to the land involved in such fraudulent sale; and all public lands irrigable under the project shall be entered subject to the conditions of this section, which shall be applied thereto: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended for construction until a contract or contracts shall have been executed between the United States and the State of Montana, whereby the State shall assume the duty and responsibility of promoting the development and settlement of the project after completion, including the subdivision of lands held in private ownership by any individual in excess of 160 irrigable acres, the securing, selection, and financing of settlers to enable the purchase of the required livestock, equipment, and supplies and the improvement of the lands to render them habitable and productive. The State shall provide the funds necessary for this purpose and shall conduct operations in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands;

So as to read:

Sun River project, Montana: For operation and maintenance, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, \$611,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 9, to insert:

Spanish Springs extension, Newlands project, Nevada: For continued investigations, commencement of construction, necessary expenses in connection therewith, and for operation, under the provisions of section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes," approved December 5, 1924, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, commencing with line 10, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some statistics in support of the amendment. This amendment is not pro forma at all, and I am satisfied that this information will be of benefit to some who are not familiar with the subject. This item was recommended by the Department of the Interior at the last session, and was also recommended by the Budget. It has again been recommended by the Department of the Interior at this session and recommended by the Budget, and I ask that this data be placed in the RECORD, because it might be necessary for use in the future.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not want the illustrations put in the RECORD?

Mr. PITTMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. SMOOT. Just the printed matter?

Mr. PITTMAN. Just the printed matter—the statistics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, December 10, 1924.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: In order to place the matter beyond question, let me state that I am in favor of an appropriation by this Congress for the Spanish Springs division of the Newlands project. I presented the argument for this to the Budget Bureau and to the Appropriations Committee. The latter will be found on pages 443 to 445. Again, on page 462 there is the definite recommendation. The answer to Mr. CRAMTON's inquiry which you quote was made as it was because of a confidence in the passage of the reclamation act then before the Senate. That act, in subsection 3, gives the right to select settlers. I felt assured that this act would pass and that my reply would have no bearing on Spanish Springs, or any other of the projects, when they came to be dealt with by Congress.

In answer to some inquiries which have been made as to the meaning of my statement that the reclamation act, with its amendments, does not give all that is needed, the thing that I had definitely in mind is the need for legislation that will permit of extending advances to settlers in the development of their farms. With conditions as they are and with the high project costs, I regard such aid as indispensable to the success of these new projects, but the law does not need to be passed now. It will be two or three years before we are ready for settlement. The sooner it is passed, however, the better.

Regarding your suggestion as to making my position understood, that is not at all in doubt. It is clearly stated in the hearings, and so far as the Spanish Springs project is concerned it will be dealt with in detail in an article of mine which is to appear in an early number of the Country Gentleman.

I have just received a letter from the Acting Chief Engineer inclosing a report by Mr. Debler. A copy is inclosed in the thought that it might have some interest to you. In this connection the Secretary has prepared a statement to relieve the anxiety of the existing irrigators under the Lahontan Reservoir, which I trust will remove the backbone you are getting from that area.

Sincerely yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, November 29, 1924.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am inclosing a copy of the November 29 issue of the Country Gentleman, with marked pages 7 and 38. This article was written at the solicitation of the Curtis Publishing Co., who called my attention to a bulletin written by R. P. Teele, of the Department of Agriculture, and asked for an article by way of response to this bulletin.

Without attempting to enter into any controversy I have made a statement of western conditions and the need for development and the way to overcome obstacles. Let me know what you think of this.

In the last of these articles there will be special attention paid to the needs of Nevada, and these two installments will appear in later issues.

Sincerely yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

[From the Country Gentleman]

THE FUTURE OF RECLAMATION—CONGRESS MUST ACT TO KEEP THE IRRIGATION SETTLERS FROM FURTHER BANKRUPTCY
(By Elwood Mead, Commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation)

Reclamation of arid land by the Federal Government promises to be a live issue at this session of Congress, as it was during the presidential campaign. There is an evident belief that the time has come for a painstaking appraisal of what irrigation can and should do for the national welfare.

The position of President Coolidge was clearly defined in a message to Congress last April, transmitting a report of a Committee of Special Advisers on Reclamation, appointed by Secretary Work to investigate methods and policies of this bureau. He indorsed this committee's report and recommended legislation in accordance therewith.

The action of Congress on this report and recommendation will vitally affect western economic progress.

The reclamation act was passed in 1902, and since then \$156,000,000 has been spent on irrigation works in the 17 arid States. Now there are leaders in all parties who believe a halt should be called in bringing more land under cultivation, no matter what may be the peculiar needs for local food supplies in the arid sections of the country.

They fear it will augment the present overproduction of certain farm products and cause a further decline in the present low prices.

A recent bulletin on land reclamation, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, is opposed to the present Federal policy. Its objection is based on the economic proposition that advancing money to build reservoirs and canals, to be repaid over a long period without interest, is a subsidy, and that there is no justification for a national subsidy to increase land settlement. This bulletin states that if aid is needed it should be given by the localities directly benefited.

One of the ablest political economists of this country suggests an entirely new reclamation policy. He says the Nation should build the reservoirs and, if necessary, give them to those using the water, but that the States should build the canals, subdivide and settle the land, and do whatever is necessary for prompt development of farms.

A HARD AND COSTLY JOB

Discussions of this character are of value. Out of these arguments will come a better understanding of the relations of reclamation to the Nation's welfare and of the legal, social, and economic problems which have to be solved.

Public opinion in the arid States favors Federal reclamation. Without this fund the costly works required to regulate and distribute western rivers could not be built.

Settlers must have more generous terms in paying for these works than private enterprise could afford to give.

Secretary Work believes in new works, but he believes more strongly in the recommendations of the advisory committee that more attention be given to settlers' needs. He has lived for many years in an arid State and has been in close contact with the struggles of the pioneer irrigator.

One who has seen the long, costly, and toilsome effort required to put fertility into soil deprived of its humus by the heat and drought of unnumbered centuries is apt to be an advocate of anything that will make the settler's task easier and his rewards more certain.

Those who have seen inexperienced men struggle without aid or expert direction trying to smooth the surface of a field so water would flow over it evenly know that this task is engineering and not agriculture.

It should be based on a contour survey and corrected by levels as the work progresses. It requires special instruments, a knack that not all men can acquire, and on which the green beginner can waste an unbelievable quantity of time and money.

Any decision as to future action should take into account what led to the passage of the reclamation act 22 years ago and what would be the result of suspending its operation.

If this is done it will be realized that in many ways the arid West is a distinct part of the country with problems, needs, and institutions wholly unlike the East.

The western irrigator can not live to himself, no matter how much he desires to hoe his own row and do as he pleases. He is bound with his neighbors in a common tie of dependence on the irrigation canal, as communities and even States are dependent on the division and control of rivers.

He has expenses in changing desert land into productive fields of which the eastern farmer knows nothing.

He is freed from the uncertainty which goes with dependence on rain, but he pays for this in greater cost of operation, in the need for combination and cooperation, and has to obligate his farm to repay the immense costs of works to control streams and distribute their life-giving water.

The Federal reclamation act grew out of these peculiar western conditions.

DEVELOPING A NATIONAL ASSET

When Federal aid was provided virtually all the land which could be reclaimed at low cost had been irrigated and settled. The diversion of rivers and the storage of floods were beyond the means of the pioneer settler or the credit of sparsely settled States.

Wyoming, which has a land area equal to that of all New England with Indiana added, had only 103,000 people. One could ride for days through its interior without meeting a man or seeing a house.

The assessed value of the State's taxable property was only \$43,300,000, a little more than double the cost of the Shoshone project, the first Government enterprise in the State, which has already cost \$8,972,000 and which will cost about \$20,000,000 before it is completed.

Such an undertaking was beyond the means of this undeveloped Commonwealth.

The East had people who wanted farms, and it had the accumulated wealth with which to develop them. When this act was passed in 1902, about 74,000,000 people, of the total population of 79,000,000 in the United States as a whole, lived east of the arid domain, and only 5,000,000 within its borders, although it embraces between one-third and one-half of the country's area.

It was to the interest of the Nation that local traffic for trans-continental railways be increased, that more people find homes in the arid States, and that the wealth of water in mountain streams and land in lonely valleys should be put to human use.

The proceeds of the sales of public land and, later, a part of the revenue from oil leases were set aside as a fund with which to build irrigation works.

This fund is now growing at the rate of about a million dollars a month.

Thirty-eight million, or about a quarter of the total accumulation, has been spent building dams and reservoirs, which include some of the world's greatest irrigation structures.

Interest in the West has thus far been centered almost entirely in material results. There has been a struggle for appropriations to build new works, and it has seemed enough that these were followed by a creation of new wealth in land and an increase in income from taxes.

There has been a surprising indifference on the part of the arid States as to the methods of settlement adopted, or the hard conditions met by settlers.

The whole matter has been regarded as an affair of the Government. This is not as it should be.

Nearly all the arid States are now in a position to share in the financial responsibility. If they had such share, there would be a more careful local scrutiny of proposed new projects and a more rapid and prosperous agricultural development.

A more active eastern interest will help toward this important end.

We are not merely bringing land and water into use, we are laying the foundations of a rural civilization under which in future years millions will dwell.

It is, therefore, a matter of gratification that other sections of the country show a growing interest in the subject.

This awakened public interest is largely due to the action of Secretary of the Interior Work in appointing an advisory committee to study the subject.

AN ADVISORY BOARD DIGS IN

On becoming head of this department he found an unsatisfactory percentage of settlers who were able to meet their payments to the Government and who were in danger of losing their farms through the foreclosure of mortgages or repayment of money spent in equipping their farms.

The record showed a percentage of tenancy too high for an agency created to help men become farm owners.

The Secretary appointed an advisory board to investigate and report on reclamation methods and policies. He stated:

"Reclamation has done much toward the development of the West, but it now clearly requires to be adapted to existing conditions, so that its future success may be achieved and the possibility of home ownership be assured to settlers."

The Secretary further said that these results were menaced by requests for extensions of time, which, if granted, would multiply the deferred payments beyond the ability of the settler to pay, and that would mean the loss of the home to the settler or the loss of its investment to the Government.

The board's report praised the engineering achievements, but stated that not enough attention had been paid to the problems of the individual settler for whom this development was made and who must return the construction cost.

It scored the speculation in privately owned land reclaimed with Government money and recommended sweeping changes in the methods of development of large holdings of private land which would be included in future projects.

A NEW DEAL IN SIGHT

Public interest was further stimulated when the Secretary, in recommending new projects, included a proviso that these projects, if carried out, should be inaugurated and developed under the methods and policies recommended by the advisory board.

Government expenditure and the plans for reclamation have, in the past, stopped with building canals and reservoirs.

Entirely outside of the cost of the land, or the cost of the water right, the necessary expenses in making farms of raw land often reach \$100 an acre or more.

Settlers began without having any adequate idea of what they were to do or what the improvement of their farm would cost. When their money was exhausted there is no place where more could be obtained, except through friends or through the favor of local banks. Local interest rates are high—from 8 to 12 per cent.

The settler has had to enter on his task, paying interest rates higher than agriculture can support, in constant dread of losing his all through foreclosure.

A new settlement is not a pleasant place for a local banker. It means lending money to people he does not know, without adequate security.

That has been the financial condition under which 24 reclamation projects have been developed.

When we compare this with the \$3,000 loans made by Australia to help each settler improve his farm, with the 90-year loans at 3½ per cent interest, made in Denmark, to help men become farm owners, we have to admit that America has something to learn from other countries.

Hereafter the construction cost of irrigation works will be high.

No new irrigation project is being considered where the construction cost is less than \$100 an acre. Some will be over \$200.

Where the land has to be bought the cost of the improved farm outside the water right will average \$100 an acre. That means a total outlay of \$200 to \$300 an acre.

So large an investment makes it imperative that all the conditions which affect feasibility and profits should be carefully studied before public money is invested in works or farmers advised to spend theirs in buying and improving farms.

The conduct of reclamation is under the control of Congress. If there is money in the fund there is great pressure to secure it. All that is technically needed in making an appropriation is an estimate of the cost of the irrigation works.

The value of a project is not, however, measured by the cost of canals or reservoirs, but by the value of crops which can be grown with the water these provide.

Variation in soil fertility is one of the features of the arid West. The importance of soil examination was not at first understood. The charge on the worthless acre was made as high as on the good one.

The settlers who came in did not realize that one farm would be an open road to success, and that another one under the same project meant absolute disaster.

Making the same charge on all acres, regardless of their fertility, or other conditions, has produced great inequality in opportunity. The settler who gets a farm in sight of the railway station has a much better chance than the unlucky one whose land is located 10 miles away.

There is some land with a surface so even that an expense of \$10 an acre will prepare it for the application of water, and there is other land with a surface so broken and uneven that smoothing it down will cost \$100 an acre.

GIVING THE SETTLER A CHANCE

Alkali and hardpan soil are the two dangers of irrigation development. On one project there is an area of 8,000 acres of hard soil which was all settled.

On many farms costly homes were erected. Now it is all abandoned. The settlers starved out.

On another project 500 settlers who took homes on an alkali soil had to give up. The Government has lost or will lose its investment in the canals. The settler lost the money he brought with him and years of fruitless toil.

Impatience of Congress or of communities for favorable reports ought not to lead to hasty decisions or neglect to consider all the factors that affect success.

On projects carried out hereafter, the prices of water rights should vary with its value, in agriculture, exactly as land values vary where moisture comes from the rain. Only in this way can all settlers have an equal chance.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, December 9, 1924.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: I have your letter of December 5 relative to Spanish Springs. I have no doubt that provision will be made for it before the session closes. This result will be largely due to your vigorous action.

Talking with Mr. Kent and Mr. Stoddard about this last night, I endeavored to remove their apprehensions of a curtailment of their water supply. Cutting off 30,000 acres of the area proposed last year, we have removed the danger of taking in more land than we could irrigate. The way seems clear to commence construction, but I hope we shall have before settlement a provision for advances to settlers in the development of their farms. Aid in the development of farms should supplement building canals.

I had a talk with Senator KENDRICK about breaking the ice for aid to farm development on later projects by providing for a demonstration of aid in farm development on the Willwood unit of the Shoshone project. It has about 18,000 acres of Government land that can be thrown open to settlement in 1925. If the Senator undertakes to secure this, I hope it will have your support.

Sincerely yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

DECEMBER 5, 1924.

HON. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DOCTOR: I am in receipt of your letter inclosing your copy of the report of the special committee on agricultural and economic development of lands adjacent to the Newlands reclamation project under the proposed Spanish Springs Storage Reservoir.

I have been studying this report with a great deal of interest. It appears to be carefully and conservatively prepared. I will preserve this copy very carefully for you and return it at any time you desire, and in any event in two or three days.

I assume that you know from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 2 the action I took with regard to the second deficiency appropriation bill. I have been assured by every member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate that they will stand by me in forcing the Spanish Springs amendment upon the Interior Department appropriation bill.

I have prepared an amendment to be offered by Congressman RICHARDS, of Nevada, to the pending Interior Department appropriation bill, now pending in the House. I have also elicited the support of Mr. GARRETT, the minority leader, Judge CORDELL HULL, and other influential Members on the Democratic side.

I am in hopes that the House will adopt this amendment. It would save us considerable trouble in conference. I am determined, however, that Mr. CRAMTON shall not enforce his judgment against your judgment and all of those who are supporting it.

I want to again assure you that I will be pleased to assist you in any legislation that you deem necessary for the success of your bureau.

Sincerely,

KEY PITTMAN,

DECEMBER 6, 1924.

HON. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. MEAD: On yesterday Congressman RICHARDS, of Nevada, offered an amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill then pending in the House. Here is the amendment:

"Spanish Springs irrigation project, Nevada: For continued investigations, acquisition of rights of way and reservoir sites, commencement of construction, if found feasible, and incidental operations, \$500,000."

The amendment and debate upon the amendment will be found on page 217 and following pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5.

It will be observed from the debate that Mr. CRAMTON used your testimony before the committee for the purpose of defeating the amendment. He particularly referred to this question and answer in the hearings:

"Mr. CRAMTON. So that is what you mean by feasibility. Your idea would be more clearly met if instead of using the language that

is here we should appropriate the money and say, 'Provided none of this money shall be available until Congress gives the Reclamation Service the authority to select the settlers.' That expresses your idea?"

"Doctor MEAD. Yes."

I am satisfied from your prior testimony and from my personal knowledge of your attitude with regard to the amendment that you misunderstood the purport of Mr. CRAMTON's question. There is no doubt that your ideas would be more clearly met with regard to the method of making irrigation projects feasible by obtaining legislation that would permit the selection of homesteaders. You could not have meant that you would refuse to supply a project with the additional water required under contract with settlers unless Congress should authorize you to select settlers for other lands that might be irrigated from the same reservoir. You have in effect stated too often that it is not only the duty of the Government to supply this additional water, but that it is the only way to save to the Government a very large investment that it has already made.

There were only a handful of Representatives in the Chamber yesterday when the amendment was defeated. I am satisfied had there been a full attendance that the amendment would have carried. Of course, the twist that Mr. CRAMTON gave to your testimony was damaging. I had been assured by Mr. FINIS GARRETT, the minority leader, that he was in favor of the amendment.

I have introduced a proposed amendment which has been referred to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and which reads as follows:

"Spanish Springs irrigation project, Nevada: For continued investigations, acquisition of rights of way and reservoir sites, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, \$500,000."

I have been assured by every member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate that they will support such amendment, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. I even have stronger assurances with regard to the matter.

This amendment will undoubtedly be placed in the bill by the Senate as it was last year. If Mr. CRAMTON, through his stubbornness and his determination to set his will and judgment against the administration, continues his tactics of obstruction and destruction in the conference committee of the House of Representatives he will arouse great antagonism which may be extended to other appropriation bills.

I know that you will take some steps to remove from the minds of Congress the misapprehension as to your position with regard to the Spanish Springs project created by the testimony which Mr. CRAMTON quoted.

The telegram from the Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association, inserted in the debate by Mr. CRAMTON, will be properly met.

With expressions of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely,

KEY PITTMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, December 11, 1924.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: We are transmitting herewith, for your information, copy of a telegram addressed to the President by the Lahontan Water Users' Association regarding Spanish Springs Reservoir.

Very truly yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 11, 1924.

The PRESIDENT, The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The time has arrived for the adoption of a broad program of reclamation development. Reclamation legislation recently enacted by Congress will improve the condition of settlers and make it possible for them to meet their payments to the Government in the future. It omits, however, certain required features to supply which additional legislation is needed, which will—

(a) Define the policy and procedure with respect to cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in the development of new projects;

(b) Provide for amortized payments with a low rate of interest on advances made by the Government for the development of farms;

(c) Bring about the adoption of a unified plan for the colonization and closer settlement of land in excess of homestead units held in private ownership.

I suggest that Congress be invited to appoint a joint congressional committee to consider these questions, with a view to drawing up a reclamation code which will constitute a policy and working plan for existing projects and future development. To this end I have outlined herein certain methods and measures which this department has tentatively adopted.

EXISTING PROJECTS

1. The obligations of settlers on existing projects should be adjusted and a basis provided for future payments. This will require a reappraisal of areas to determine their ability to produce profitable crops under irrigation.

2. The Government has expended a large amount of money in the construction of reservoirs which are only partly used, with a consequent heavy loss of income. There are other projects where storage is needed to utilize the distributing works. A definite construction program for the completion of works needed to secure the full benefit of the Government's investment and complete utilization of the resources on these projects should be adopted.

3. The management and control of existing works should be transferred to the water users, where they are in a position to organize and to be entrusted with this authority, the form of such organization to be that of an irrigation district operating under State laws.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

4. All investigations of future projects should include a comprehensive study of legal, engineering, economic, agricultural, and financial conditions. Legal studies are needed to determine the title to water rights; engineering studies to determine the cost of irrigation works; economic studies to determine the value of land held in private ownership, the outlay required to change raw land into farms, and the character of markets; agricultural studies to determine the crops suited to the locality and the productive value of water under irrigation; financial studies to determine sources of credit, interest rates, and cost of settlement and farm development. The results of these investigations should be submitted to Congress and to the authorities of the State in which the development is located.

5. On all projects undertaken hereafter the State in which the development is located should participate in the selection of settlers and the development of farms. The States should not be required to contribute to construction costs, but should be required to contribute to the fund provided for advances to settlers for farm development, as they now contribute to the construction of roads and to agricultural education.

6. A fund should be provided from which money can be advanced to help worthy, needy settlers improve and equip their farms. Such advances should bear interest and for permanent improvements should extend over long periods. Four per cent is suggested as the interest rate.

7. There are almost as many farm laborers as farm owners in this country. The conditions under which the families of farm laborers live are therefore a matter of great importance. Provision should be made on these projects to give the farm laborer an opportunity to acquire a home and a garden, the number to be limited to the local demand for hired labor. In this way we will train up the farm owners of the future.

8. Provision for advice and direction to settlers in the development of their farms and in working out plans of marketing and cultivation should be a feature of all new development.

GENERAL

9. The plans for future reclamation development must take into consideration the needs of the different States, the water-right problems of interstate streams, the amount of the reclamation fund which will be available during the next 20 years. The construction of reservoirs by the Bureau of Reclamation under a forward-looking plan of this character will be an effective agency for lessening controversy and securing an equitable distribution of the water supply.

10. Efforts to reach an agreement for the economic apportionment of water of interstate streams, now being made by the States, have the cordial approval and support of this department. It is infinitely better than the costly and unsettling litigation certain to arise unless such agreements are reached. It ought to be possible under such agreements to work out plans for the storage and regulation of the water of the Missouri, Colorado, Platte, Rio Grande, and Columbia Rivers and their tributaries. Such action on the Colorado is urgently needed to protect the Yuma reclamation project from danger by floods and the Imperial Valley irrigation district in California from being devastated both by floods and drought.

11. The primary purpose of all reclamation construction is to extend irrigation. In all storages there will be incidental benefits to come from the development of power. Whatever arrangements are made for such power development or its distribution, there should be such control by the Government as to prevent interference with the use of the stored water in irrigation.

RECLAMATION OF SWAMP, CUT-OVER, AND NEGLECTED LAND

12. The reclamation act recently passed by Congress authorizes an appropriation of \$100,000, to be used in part for reclamation investigations in sections of the country outside of the arid region. It is believed that there is a field for the closer settlement and creation of prosperous homes on areas of neglected swamp or cut-over land. The

methods of colonization and the economic conditions under which these new communities will be established are of special importance. All such investigations should be cooperative, the State to contribute one-half of the cost. It is believed that States like North Carolina and South Carolina, which have commissions dealing with settlement, will welcome such cooperation, and that such action will promote rural progress in sections where it will be of national advantage.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK.

WHAT THE RECLAMATION PROJECT SETTLER NEEDS IN CASH AND COURAGE

(By Elwood Mead, Commissioner Bureau of Reclamation)

The greater part of the land to be reclaimed under future Government irrigation projects will be privately owned. There should be a settlement plan for this land which will embrace everything in excess of homestead units.

It will not do to leave this to the coordinated efforts of the individual owners. If they are expected to secure settlers, improvement will be slow and payments of project costs to the Government long delayed.

Much of the land has been filed on by people who have never been farmers and never expect to be, and who look to Government reclamation as a chance to realize a profit without taking any part in the development.

Explaining this attitude on one of the proposed projects, the committee in charge said that the owners of these lands asked the committee who had valued their unimproved land at \$5 an acre to raise this value to \$25 an acre, because people coming in should not harvest the profits over people who had homesteaded. That if the plan of paying 5 per cent of the crop returns was adopted, the price the settler paid for the land would never enter into his calculations.

Those who have seen the struggles of settlers to meet interest on the unpaid land payments know that this view is wholly mistaken.

Another holder of several thousand acres on one of the proposed projects was asked what he was going to do with the land. His answer was, "Sell it to settlers."

Qualified appraisers say this land is worth \$5 an acre, but this owner's price is \$50 an acre, and if the law is not changed, he will try to get a rake-off of \$45 an acre, which will be just that much of a burden on those who have to assume in addition the payment of project costs to the Government.

In the past, high prices for unimproved land was an economic injustice; in the future, it will prevent development.

PIONEER DAYS ARE PAST

Commissions were appointed last June to investigate the agricultural and economic features of projects now before Congress. They were mainly local men. Cooperation of the State agricultural colleges of California, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho made this possible. Other members came from the Reclamation Service and Department of Agriculture. After the technical reports were prepared, they were reviewed by local boards of hard-headed business men.

When the appointment of residents of States where the project was located as members of these committees was discussed, objection was raised that a local board would make a booster report, in which advantages would be stressed and obstacles ignored.

The following quotation from a letter written by one of these members shows the spirit in which they performed their task:

"I have insisted with my colleagues in the State, during the time we have been working on this matter that we must not under any conditions make any recommendations for projects or parts of projects that are not financially sound. Although we have great need of water, we also have a reputation to sustain."

All the reports show a painstaking appraisal of conditions under which future farm homes will have to be created.

The soil has been classified, the cost of levelling land and erecting the necessary buildings carefully estimated, crop programs and the probable earning power of the land worked out. These are invaluable aids to determining the feasibility of these projects.

These reports are conservative in their recommendations as to credit or Government aid in farm development. This was inevitable. Western men made them, and in the West settlement has been individualistic.

Members of these commissions have, however, recognized that this Nation has left the pioneer period, that we must begin to study what other countries have done to provide a substitute for free land. Included in their recommendations are the following:

That on each of these projects a demonstration settlement be established, having an area of 10,000 to 15,000 acres; that is, homes for about 200 families.

That the farms on these demonstration settlements vary in size from 20 acres to 160 acres.

That the land be cleared of brush, part of it leveled, and part of it planted to a fodder crop, like alfalfa, before the farms are thrown open to settlement.

That where the areas are rough and irregular, the Government subdivision be disregarded, and farms be laid out to have their boundaries fit the topography of the country. In this way both irrigation and cultivation will be made cheaper.

That qualifications be fixed for settlers. These qualifications to include some farming experience, a designated minimum capital, which might be part in money and part in farm equipment.

That a practical farm adviser have charge of the settlement to aid settlers in buying farm equipment, in working out farm programs, and in arranging to do things that a community can do better than individuals working alone.

That payments for advances on improvements should be amortized and extend over a period varying from 30 to 40 years, with interest at 5 per cent.

WHAT THE SETTLER NEEDS

That payments on money advanced for equipment be repaid in periods varying from 5 to 20 years, with 5 per cent interest.

These reports state that the equipment of a farm should include:

- A house.
- Buildings to shelter livestock and implements.
- One or more cows and one or more horses.
- Furniture for the house and machinery for the farm.
- The levelling of the land to bring about even flow of water in irrigation.

Small lateral ditches to distribute water.
Boundary and subdivision fences.
Money for living expenses until there is an income.
This adventure into the field of rural planning has been dubbed paternalism by its enemies, but it is not more paternal than for the Government to build the canals and forego interest.

The money advanced would contribute to the comfort and the security of homes, it would lessen tenancy, and go a long way toward making these projects solvent.

The opinion that irrigation development should be suspended because the crops grown on irrigated farms will compete with those of the East is based on a complete misconception of western conditions.

It is within truth to say that for every dollar's worth of agricultural products which compete in the market with eastern farms, the mines and factories sustained by the agriculture of the West create markets for \$3 worth of eastern products.

The opinion that aid if needed, should be given by the arid States, and not by the Nation, is worthy of attention. If States are required to assume a part of the financial liability of each new project within their borders, there would be less political pressure to have the Government undertake enterprises of doubtful merit. There would be an undoubted gain if the State participated in the selection of settlers and helped work out agricultural programs for settlers.

But to lay the whole financial burden of development on young, sparsely peopled, heavily taxed arid States would be most unfair. They now have to bear the burden of government over great areas of untaxed public land.

If the States are to build irrigation works they should be given the revenue from land, coal, and oil.

Many of these projects have a national value greater than their cost. In order to show how Federal reclamation has proved to be a source of social and political strength to the nation, as well as a creator of wealth in land, examples of what has been achieved through carrying out two projects and what will follow the construction of another, will be given.

The Newlands project in Nevada is a striking illustration of the public benefits of this policy. Without Federal aid it would not exist.

The State could not have made the attempt because of lack of taxable wealth and population. Out of its great domain of 70,000,000 acres, only 595,000 acres were farmed in 1920. Law and order have to be maintained and supported by 77,000 people. This is a little over one to the square mile, counting the children.

This handful of people is doing surprising things. It is improving farm practice, supports a fine educational system and is building concrete highways.

It is interesting, therefore, to consider what part national reclamation plays in providing an economic foundation for these activities.

The Newlands project has cost thus far about \$8,000,000. On the land reclaimed by these works are modern towns with electric lights, schools and churches, creameries and beet-sugar factories.

More than 10,000 people live on the project. More than a third of the State's agricultural products come from its farms.

The Newlands project is now only partly completed. A costly canal, built to utilize the water of the Truckee River, is almost unused because the stream falls in midsummer, and farmers can not settle on the land it commands. A reservoir to hold the spring floods is needed.

Building this will enable one thousand 40-acre farms to be opened up to settlement.

Factories which would otherwise go elsewhere will be located in Reno. Stockmen can have more fodder and can carry more stock on the open range. Without this, population is not likely to increase, because mining is declining and the lumber industry is nearing its end.

Whatever helps Nevada grow in population and wealth is a national benefit. But settlers can not advance the four or five million dollars the works will cost; neither can the State. The money must come from the reclamation fund and be provided on its generous terms.

These are the conclusions of a board of experts from the University of California, the University of Nevada, the Department of Agriculture, and Bureau of Reclamation appointed to investigate the project.

The report of these investigators shows that the lands under this extension are fertile. That 40 acres will make a farm; that 2 acres will mean comfort and independence for an American farm worker and his family.

The report shows that these farms will not compete with those of Iowa or Illinois or States farther east. There will be more dairy farms, but the milk, butter, and cheese will go to Reno, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and islands of the Pacific.

Completion of the Newlands project will do for Nevada what the Salt River project has done for Arizona. Of the State's 72,000,000 acres only 713,000 acres were cultivated in 1920. One-third of this area, or 204,000 acres, was irrigated from the canals of this scheme. The value of last year's crops was \$18,000,000, or nearly half the value of the agricultural products of the whole State.

Where would Arizona be without this development? There is now enough local wealth and local credit in the Salt River Valley to maintain and extend this enterprise. It has been turned over to local control. Payments to the Government are being made and extensions to cost \$4,000,000 are planned.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended the construction of the Salt Lake Basin project in Utah. The total cost of this will be about \$15,000,000. The initial appropriation recommended was \$1,500,000.

Utah is a prosperous agricultural State, largely because much of the State's irrigation development was financed by the Mormon Church. But even the church could not go further than provide for the use of the natural flow of streams, so when a reservoir was needed it had to be built by the Government.

One has been completed in Strawberry Valley. It is a success. The Salt Lake Basin project embraces storage works on streams, the regulation of the height of Utah Lake, and connection of rivers so as to secure the complete use of the water resources of seven counties.

No private enterprise would attempt to harmonize conflicting interests of these separated communities even if it could raise the money. Even a State committee could not alone secure from the people of different valleys an agreement as to where this development should begin.

The result of union of Federal and State effort is an agreement to begin on the regulation of Weber River. A reservoir will give late water to small farms already improved. There will be a canal to carry part of the water over a mountain divide to give complete irrigation to farms in Provo Valley. There will be larger yields, surer crops, and a greater reward to cultivators of hundreds of farms.

These are some of the material benefits of national reclamation. They are a sufficient justification of the policy, but the 135,000 families who live on these projects are its best defense. Thousands more are needed in these sparsely settled States.

[From the New Reclamation Era, December, 1924]

ECONOMIC INVESTIGATION OF SPANISH SPRINGS PROJECT—COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS POINTS OUT THAT 50 ACRES COMPRISES THE MOST DESIRABLE FARM UNIT, INTENSIVELY FARMED ON BASIS OF DAIRYING, CANTALOUPE, POULTRY, AND A VARIETY OF OTHER CASH CROPS—CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

LOCAL INDORSEMENT

RENO, NEV., October 30, 1925.

MR. DAVID WEEKS,

Agricultural Hall, Berkeley, Calif.

DEAR MR. WEEKS: Your committee of bankers and business men appointed by Gov. J. G. Scrugham have studied the report of special committee to the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, on agricultural and economic development of lands adjacent to the Newlands reclamation project under the proposed Spanish Springs storage reservoir, and beg leave to report as follows:

We have studied said report and find that it covers the situation thoroughly, and unanimously approve the same with the following four suggestions:

1. Raw lands, without water, should be purchased at from \$10 to \$15 per acre.

2. Dairying, poultry raising, and diversified farming producing crops which will command a ready cash market are recommended.

3. Farm units should be small, and settlers selected who have a capital of from \$1,500 to \$2,500 and who should be encouraged by additional financial assistance as the Government may provide and at a reasonable rate of interest.

4. The Spanish Springs project is feasible and attractive to settlers. The Government should receive back the construction cost in a reasonable period of years under the plan providing for 5 per cent of the gross annual return to be collected and applied to construction costs.

Very truly yours,

J. SHEEHAN.
GEO. WINGFIELD.
W. H. SIMMONS.
W. J. HARRIS.
W. A. SHOCKLEY.

Irrigable area: soils: The soils of the Spanish Springs project, Nevada, recommended for irrigation development are largely bench lands lying in seven distinct compact bodies elevated several feet above the Truckee River. The land in each of these areas has been divided so far as possible into three classes on the basis of a field examination supplemented by the detailed classification made by Hawley in 1912. The difference between the first two classes is largely a matter of cost of preparation for irrigation, while the third class is not recommended for irrigation because of various unfavorable conditions. The lands recommended for development are uniform in quality, having a fairly uniform topography, and contain little or no alkali. The lands are on the whole of a higher grade than those now under irrigation in this region. There are in the irrigable area 46,096 acres of land from which deductions have been made for lands under the Indian canal amounting to 2,659 acres, private lands with possessory claims which have been validated amounting to 1,448 acres, and land to be allotted to the Indians under act of Congress of April 21, 1904, amounting to 2,635 acres. The irrigable area is thus reduced to a little more than 39,350 acres. In addition to these lands, there are approximately 7,500 acres of land under water contract in the Newlands project requiring supplemental water from the Truckee River, bringing the total area to be provided with water from the Truckee River to 46,850 acres, 65 per cent of which is first-class land and 35 per cent of which is second-class land. It is estimated that it will cost \$40 per acre to level and prepare for irrigation the first-class lands, while second-class lands will require about \$60 per acre.

These lands are located very favorably in regard to drainage. Costs for ultimate drainage will be low in comparison with other projects, and it has been estimated that the drainage costs will approximate an average of \$5 per acre. This does not take into consideration lands under the Indian canal, which will undoubtedly be seeped to some considerable extent by the construction of this project. The costs of draining these Indian lands have not been considered in estimates included in this report. An allowance of 10 per cent has been made in the land area recommended for the farm unit for lands that may be or may become unproductive.

Estimated acre costs for construction: Storage development to the extent of 100,000 acre-feet at Spanish Springs and necessary distribution systems would involve an expenditure of approximately \$122 per acre. Limiting the storage to this capacity would mean a curtailment in total acreage. The extent of this reduction in area can not be determined without further analysis. Whether it will be more economical to increase storage capacity at Spanish Springs at a higher acre cost or cut down the acreage under the Newlands project depends upon two undetermined factors. One of these is the area feasible of irrigation under the existing Newlands project and the other is the probable cost of storage necessary to provide adequate regulation for that area and the additional area proposed to be brought under irrigation.

Operation and maintenance costs: Costs of operating and maintaining the irrigation system in the Newlands project is now about \$2 per acre per year. This cost will be changed but little by the increase in area. Savings because of the greater area will be offset by greater costs of operating canals carrying more nearly their full capacity.

The problem of securing settlers: Under present conditions and present available credit facilities, settlers probably could not be secured in sufficient numbers to settle upon the lands of this project who have funds needed for carrying out the necessary agricultural development for bringing their farms to full production in a reasonable period. This statement is based upon experience in this locality and in other parts of the irrigated region.

The amount of costs settlers can stand on fully developed farms: Allowing for water deficiencies, pests, a certain amount of reduction in prices, and other contingencies, it is estimated that the average settler will probably be able to pay on the fully developed farm \$915 per year for interest and repayment of capital borrowed for agricultural development and construction.

Financial requirements under various plans of development: Estimates of financial requirements have been made on the basis of acre costs, amounting to \$120 for storage and distribution works, \$10 for domestic water supply, and \$10 for land. Since these estimates have

been made a study of the available water supply indicates the possibility of increased acre costs depending upon the extent to which land area is reserved for development under the Lahontan Reservoir. Acre costs may also be increased by administrative overhead, which has not been included. The following estimates are given for the purpose of indicating to what extent and under what conditions increased acre costs would be feasible:

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 50-ACRE FARM. THE SETTLER MOVES ONTO THE FARM IN ITS RAW CONDITIONS, UN-LEVELLED, WITHOUT IRRIGATION, LATERALS, BUILDINGS, OR FENCES

(a) If the farmer must avail himself of existing credit agencies and provisions of the reclamation act now in force as it applies to homestead lands, with no plan of financing agricultural development, his total financial requirement the first six years in excess of his income will be approximately \$7,500 for all expenditures for living, operation, and development, while the requirement for the two construction payments during this period will amount to \$700 more. He may, if he has \$5,000, be able to borrow at 8 per cent interest sufficient capital to make up the balance. If he does not have \$5,000, he must have a family capable of operating and developing the farm while he devotes his entire time to outside labor. Settlers with this capital requirement or with the type of family necessary for carrying out this program are not available in sufficient numbers to settle the lands of the Spanish Springs project.

(b) If the recommendation of the fact finding commission becomes effective for repayment of construction costs on the basis of 5 per cent of the gross income, this feature alone would only reduce the capital requirement by approximately \$200.

(c) If the recommendation of the fact finding commission becomes effective, which provides long-term credit at a low rate of interest for agricultural development, the advantage becomes more pronounced. Below is a tabulation illustrating the importance of this feature of their report as applied to the Spanish Springs project. Higher rates of interest are given for comparison:

Capital of settler	Rate of interest	Additional requirement	Years required to amortize development debt	Years required to amortize construction debt
\$1,500	4	\$7,490	19	58
\$1,500	5	7,790	20	58
\$1,500	6	8,090	23	58
\$1,500	8	8,720	34	58

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 50-ACRE FARM UPON WHICH THE SETTLER MOVES AFTER THE LAND HAS BEEN LEVELED AND LATERALS CONSTRUCTED, THE COST OF THIS EXTRA WORK BEING INCLUDED IN THE CONSTRUCTION COST

(a) If the farmer must avail himself of existing credit facilities and provisions of the reclamation act as it now applies to homestead lands, with no plan of financing agricultural developments, he must have available \$7,168 for agricultural development and construction payments during the first six years. He may be able to borrow all but \$4,000 of this at 8 per cent interest. His situation is somewhat improved over that of the farmer coming on the raw land under similar circumstances. Both situations are impossible under present conditions.

(b) If he can pay for construction costs at the rate of 5 per cent of the gross income, his situation is improved but little.

(c) If he can borrow money at a low rate of interest in amounts sufficient to meet his needs and pay construction and land leveling at the rate of 5 per cent of gross income, his situation is greatly improved. The following tabular statement illustrates what can be accomplished under these circumstances:

Capital of settler	Rate of interest	Additional requirements	Years required to amortize development debt	Years required to amortize construction debt
\$1,500	4	\$6,706	19	75
\$1,500	5	7,095	19	75
\$1,500	6	7,395	21	75
\$1,500	8	8,021	28	75

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 50-ACRE FARM UPON WHICH THE SETTLER MOVES AFTER THE LAND HAS BEEN LEVELED AND 20 ACRES OF ALFALFA PLANTED PRIOR TO THE ARRIVAL OF THE SETTLER, THE COST OF WHICH IS ADDED TO THE CONSTRUCTION CHARGE

(a) If the farmer must avail himself of existing credit agencies and present provisions of the reclamation act, with no plan for financing agricultural development, he must have \$2,500 in cash or equivalent

and must expect to borrow \$1,700 in addition at 8 per cent interest to equip his farm.

(b) Payment of construction costs at the rate of 5 per cent of gross income will change these figures but little.

(c) If construction costs are paid at the rate of 5 per cent of the gross income and long-term credit provided for agricultural development, the advantage is very great. This advantage is shown in the following tabulation:

Capital of settler	Rate of interest	Additional requirements	Years required to amortize development debt	Years required to amortize construction debt
\$1,500	4	\$3,600	12	\$2
\$1,500	5	3,870	12	\$2
\$1,500	6	4,140	13	\$2
\$1,500	8	4,610	15	\$2

Effect of increased acre costs: By increasing the time of repayment of development debt to 34 years, an additional acre cost of \$60 could be amortized if land is not leveled, whereas if land is leveled and 20 acres of alfalfa planted, an additional acre cost of \$110 would be feasible. In each case it is assumed that money for agricultural development is available at 5 per cent interest and that construction costs are amortized on the basis of 5 per cent of the gross income. It is further assumed that cost of leveling of land in the second instance is included in the construction cost.

Size of farm units: The most desirable farm unit has been determined at 50 acres.

Character of agriculture: Conditions of climate and soil on the proposed project will permit the production of a considerable variety of agricultural crops, including small grains, corn, and sunflowers for silage, alfalfa, the clovers and grass pasture, potatoes, onions, cantaloupes, the small fruits, and in all probability ultimately the orchard fruits. The market conditions governing the agriculture in this region, however, and the possibility of growing three crops of alfalfa make it apparent that the success of the project must be based very largely upon the development of the dairy industry, supplemented by home flocks of poultry, a few hogs, and the raising of potatoes and cantaloupes on a small scale as an immediate cash crop.

Land values: The Southern Pacific Railway Co. has placed a value on 17,897 acres of land, part of which is within the Spanish Springs development, amounting to \$2.50 an acre for the entire tract. Of this acreage, 7,815 acres were included within the original proposed Spanish Springs development and about 4,000 acres were considered by the company as feasible for agricultural development. If \$2.50 an acre were paid for the tract, the total amount would be in the neighborhood of \$44,743, or an average of about \$18 per acre for the 4,000 acres susceptible of development into farms, considering the lands not suitable for irrigation as having no value. Irrigable land could be purchased from the railroad company at a price ranging from \$7.50 to \$20 an acre. Lands within the Indian reservation have been priced at varying amounts, the common opinion as to value of land on this reservation being in the neighborhood of \$6 an acre. Conservative bank appraisals within the Newlands project have ranged around \$150 per acre for developed farms not subject to severe alkali and drainage conditions. This does not include the cost of buildings.

Recommendations: The foregoing conclusions make possible recommendations as follows:

(a) The area of land suitable for irrigation under the Lahontan Reservoir must be established before feasibility of the project as a whole can be determined.

(b) Estimates of cost for storage and distribution on the basis of ultimate land area under Lahontan Reservoir and new development under the Spanish Springs Reservoir should be made.

(c) A financial plan should be instituted by the Government to provide funds at a low rate of interest, with long-term amortization of principal, for agricultural development and payment of construction costs and land.

(d) Agricultural development should be carried out under the supervision of the Government, represented by an expert agricultural advisor trained in the execution of problems confronting the settlers on new projects.

(e) The Government should fix prices of land to prevent speculation, and, if possible, lands should be purchased outright by the Government and sold to bona fide settlers.

(f) Settlers should be selected on the basis of their ability to farm, and each settler should have a certain amount of capital, which will depend upon the exact terms of the financial plan and the amount that settlers will have who are available in sufficient numbers.

(g) A program of development and capital requirements should be prepared, on the basis of which funds should be advanced by the Government.

(h) An agricultural program agreeable to the farmer and the Government should set forth a schedule of land utilization, livestock, and farming methods, with expected yields and income and a schedule of repayment.

(i) For a number of years contracts between the Government and settlers should be unassignable, except with the approval of the Government, in order to prevent settlement on this project by men whose sole purpose is to gain by the speculative rise in price of land.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID WEEKS,
Consulting Engineer, Berkeley, Calif.

ROBERT STEWART,
Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Nevada.

S. B. DOTEN,
Director Experiment Station, University of Nevada.

CECIL W. CREEL,
Director Extension Division, University of Nevada.

F. B. HEADLEY,
Superintendent Newlands Experiment Farm, U. S. D. A.

The lands recommended for development are uniform in quality, fairly uniform in topography, and contain little or no alkali. The net irrigable area of 39,350 acres on the whole is of a higher grade than lands under irrigation in this region. They are located favorably in regard to drainage. They will require greater quantities of water than the lower lying lands, but the acre yields will on the average be higher.

The question of the availability of a water supply for the Spanish Springs project is a part of the general program of the complicated water and power rights upon the Truckee. There are other engineering and legal problems requiring solution involving the location for storage, the withdrawal of water for the Indian lands of Pyramid Lake, and allied subjects. These problems are complex, their solution will require expert knowledge of engineering and the law, and after thoughtful examination it seems proper that they be passed upon by men of special training in these fields.

Operation and maintenance costs will approximate \$2 per acre per year.

Settlers having sufficient funds for developing these lands will probably not be available under present conditions and with existing credit facilities.

It is estimated that the fully developed farm of 50 acres will make available annually \$915 for principal and interest on money borrowed for agricultural development and construction.

Settlers with \$5,000 and with existing credit facilities could probably meet the costs of development and operation of their farms and costs of construction to the Government.

Settlers having \$1,500 would be able, if capital were provided at a low rate of interest, to meet principal and interest payments on a construction, overhead, and land cost of \$200 per acre, and on additional funds borrowed at 5 per cent interest for agricultural developments, provided the amount borrowed for development is amortized over 34 years and construction costs are repaid on the basis of 5 per cent of the gross income. If lands are leveled by the Government and the expense thereof is included in the construction cost, and if 20 acres of alfalfa are planted before the arrival of the settler, then an acre cost for construction, overhead, and land of \$250 could be paid.

The successful development of the project will depend upon the 50-acre farm unit intensively farmed on the basis of dairying, cantaloupes, and poultry, and a variety of other cash crops.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID WEEKS.
ROBERT STEWART.
S. B. DOTEN.
CECIL W. CREEL.
F. B. HEADLEY.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATION OF TRUCKEE-CARSON IRRIGATION DISTRICT REGARDING TELEGRAM AND OTHER DATA SUBMITTED BY LAHONTAN WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION

FIRST. WHOM DOES THE SO-CALLED LAHONTAN WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION REPRESENT?

This association has submitted unsupported representations, which makes pertinent the inquiry regarding the standing of this association as bearing on the credibility and accuracy of the statements submitted. The organization is a voluntary, unincorporated association, whose membership is in nowise representative of the landowners of the project. It is asserted with confidence that its membership embraces only a small percentage of the landowners of the project. The association is characterized by its antagonistic attitude on practically all propositions advanced. The Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association in fact is composed of insurgents, who, because of their inability to control the action of the irrigation district board, have

organized a water users' association. The Truckee-Carson Irrigation District is the official organization of all water users and is in no way connected with the Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association.

SECOND. ACREAGE COST OF SPANISH SPRINGS AS COMPARED WITH LAHONTAN

More or less rambling and incoherent argument is made in this matter, the conclusion being presumably that because the cost of the first water rights on the project was \$22 an acre, the higher cost now announced for Spanish Springs is necessarily prohibitive, and renders the project not feasible. Repeated reports by engineers, soil and economic experts, bankers, and others qualified by training and experience to appraise such matters, pronounce the project feasible. To this is opposed merely the postulation of farmers and other laymen whose knowledge does not equip them to pass upon such matters.

THIRD. IRRIGATION OF AREA UNDER LAHONTAN RESERVOIR

Careful and repeated surveys and reports by engineers, soil experts, and other qualified persons show that no more than 70,000 to 75,000 acres of land suitable for the purpose are available for irrigation under the Lahontan Reservoir, and this is the amount for which water is reserved under the plan for Spanish Springs. No water required for the old area will be taken for use in Spanish Springs or for irrigation of new areas. Of the old land 75,000 acres may be taken as maximum, yet the association would insist upon attempting irrigation of 151,000 acres despite the character of soil, which experience has shown can not be successfully irrigated. That this would involve visiting upon the old area the ruin which is forecast from the building of the Spanish Springs reservoir, seems certain.

FOURTH. OTHER RESERVOIR SITES ON WATERSHED

Much is said about other reservoir sites on the watershed alleged to be more suitable than Spanish Springs. Exhaustive examinations have been made by competent engineers who find Spanish Springs preferable for reasons fully stated and supported by reliable data. The association has been frequently requested to submit data, by engineers or others, worthy of consideration showing the presence of such reservoirs, but has consistently failed to do so.

FIFTH. WILL LAHONTAN FARMERS BE RUINED BY CONSTRUCTION OF SPANISH SPRINGS RESERVOIR?

Lahontan farmers will not be requested to bear any portion of the expense connected with Spanish Springs except in so far as they may be benefited by having an additional water supply upon which to rely in case of possible shortage in the supply already available. It is estimated that their proportionate part of this expense will be about \$6 an acre. There is no way in which the Lahontan water users may be made to bear any portion of this expense except by voluntary action of the landowners affected. Under the reclamation law charges already fixed can not be increased except by vote of a majority of those affected, and under the irrigation district law of the State affirmative vote must be had by not less than two-thirds of those affected. Should a majority of the landowners believe with the association that they would be ruined by construction of Spanish Springs reservoir, manifestly their proper action is to refuse participation, which is their option.

SIXTH. SO-CALLED BALLINGER CONTRACT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF WATER

This proposed contract has no connection whatever with the present plan, and has no proper place for consideration or discussion here. Its injection into the present situation is manifestly inspired by ignorance or willful intention to confuse or obscure the issues involved. The statement erroneously asserts that the Reclamation Service owns or controls Lake Tahoe. The fact is that certain power companies and other prior appropriators had acquired under the law rights which the United States is required to recognize. These rights have been upheld by the courts and can not be ignored, a fact which the association has persistently refused to consider. Other power rights along the upper reaches of the Truckee River have made it necessary to provide for additional storage below the points of use by such companies. The association imputes some evil design to this proposal, but overlooks or ignores the private rights which have already attached and which make this course mandatory.

RENO, NEV., December 9, 1924.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Resolved, That the Exchange Club of Reno, Nev., hereby condemn the attitude of L. A. Beckstead as assuming to bespeak the attitude of Lahontan Water Users' Association toward the construction of Spanish Springs Valley reservoir in that it is opposed to the position taken by the fact finding commission and by Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of the Reclamation Bureau, and Dr. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and by all well-informed engineers and people

who have investigated the facts and conditions existing at the present time, and in that his attitude is also opposed to the best interests of the people of Nevada.

EXCHANGE CLUB OF RENO,
Dr. A. F. ADAMS, President.
C. A. NICHOLS, Secretary.

FALLON, NEV., December 9, 1924.

Senator KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to L. A. Beckstead's telegram to Representative CRAMTON, in the name of the Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association, I was president of former water users' association on Newlands project, which disbanded and organized Truckee Carson irrigation district, now only organization representing water users here; so-called Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association is a secret society of a few members, not admitting all water users as such to membership, and is not authorized to represent or speak for water users generally. Large mass meeting here indorsed Spanish Springs Reservoir by 2 to 1 vote.

GEORGE W. LATTIN.

FEENEY, NEV., December 6, 1924.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the water users of bench lands of Newlands project, representing 125 farm units, strongly protest use of words "to a man" in telegram sent you by Lahontan water users, signed Beckstead, as we are now and always have been in favor of Spanish Springs, realizing that is vital to our success. In mass meeting of water users in Fallon, Spanish Springs was approved by 102 water users, 54 objecting. Therefore, we wish to strongly impress upon you that Lahontan Water Users Association are in no way a representative body of Newlands project water users. The season just finished, in which bench lands produced one-third of normal crop, is proof positive of our vital need.

FRANK W. McCULLOCH,
JAS. P. BYRNES,
JOHN H. WASH,
Committee.

RENO, NEV., December 6, 1924.

Senator KEY PITTMAN,

Senate Office Building:

Beckstead's statement opposing Spanish Springs resented here. With few selfish exceptions, Nevada unanimously favors project.

RENO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

RENO, NEV., December 7, 1924.

KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support Spanish Springs appropriation, and assure you protest of Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association does not reflect on Newlands project sentiment. Project settlers of Fernley Swingle Bench and elsewhere have repeatedly indorsed Spanish Springs extension. They consider it imperatively necessary to prevent recurrent water shortages and to bring entire program to sound state of economic development. Nevada farm bureaus have indorsed construction Spanish Springs in interest of agriculture. As new lands are to be irrigated with unused flood waters, established water rights can not be injured. Lands to be reclaimed exceptionally rich soil and will settle rapidly.

W. A. HARDY,
President Nevada Farm Bureaus, Fernley, Nev.

FALLON, NEV., January 3, 1925.

Senator KEY PITTMAN,

Washington, D. C.:

At to-days meeting of board of director of irrigation district the entire report of Kent and Stoddard, including request that telegrams sent to Washington, signed Lahontan Valley Water Users' Association, by L. A. Beckstead, secretary, be repudiated was adopted and approved. Kindly advise interested parties.

C. E. KENT.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 2, after the name "North Dakota," to insert "For operation, maintenance, and incidental operations, \$25,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Williston project (formerly North Dakota pumping project), North Dakota: For operation, maintenance, and incidental operations, \$25,000. The Director of Reclamation is authorized during the fiscal year 1925, or thereafter, to appraise the buildings, machinery, equip-

ment, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to this project and to lease or to sell the same at public or private sale, on such terms and in such manner as he may deem for the best interests of the Government, reserving the right to reject any and all bids. The proceeds from such lease or sale shall be paid into the reclamation fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$1,000,000," so as to read:

Salt Lake Basin project, Utah, first division: For construction of Echo Reservoir, Utah Lake control, and Weber-Provo Canal, and incidental operations, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That any unexpended balance of any appropriation available for the Salt Lake Basin project for the fiscal year 1925 shall remain available during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 13, after the numerals "1926," to strike out the following provisos:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts, in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law, providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project; and the amount of the construction costs charged against each district shall be payable in annual installments, the first installment to be 5 per cent of the total charge and be due and payable on the 1st day of December of the year following the date of said public notice, the remainder of the construction charge, with interest on deferred amounts from date of said public notice at 4 per cent per annum, to be amortized by payment on each December 1 thereafter of 5 per cent of said remainder for 40 years, or until the obligation is paid in full: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 20, after the figures "\$375,000," to strike out the following provisos:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project, and the amount of the construction costs charged against each district shall be payable in annual installments, the first installment to be 5 per cent of the total charge and be due and payable on the 1st day of December of the third year following the date of said public notice, the remainder of the construction charge, with interest on deferred amounts from date of said public notice at 4 per cent per annum, to be amortized by payment on each December 1 thereafter of 5 per cent of said remainder for 40 years, or until the obligation is paid in full: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum provided for herein shall be expended for construction on account of any lands in private ownership until an appropriate repayment contract in accordance with the terms of this act and, in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall have been properly executed by a district organized under State law, embracing the lands in public or private ownership irrigable under the project, and the execution thereof shall have been confirmed by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, which contract, among other things, shall contain an appraisal approved by the Secretary of the Interior, showing the present actual bona fide value of all such irrigable lands fixed without reference to the proposed construction of said Kittitas division, and shall provide that until one-half the construction charges against said lands shall have been fully paid no sale of any such lands shall be valid unless and until the purchase price involved in such sale is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall also provide that upon proof of fraudulent representation as to the true consideration involved in any such sale the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cancel the water right attaching to the land involved in such fraudulent sale; and all public lands irrigable under the project shall be entered subject to the conditions of this section which shall be applicable thereto: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended for construction until a contract or contracts shall have been executed between the United States and the State of Washington pursuant to its land settlement act embodied in chapter 188, Laws of 1919, as amended by chapter 90, Laws of 1921, and by chapters 34 and 112, Laws of 1923, or

additional enactments, if necessary, whereby the State shall assume the duty and responsibility of promoting the development and settlement of the project after completion, including the subdivision of lands held in private ownership by any individual in excess of 160 irrigable acres, the securing, selection, and financing of settlers to enable the purchase of the required livestock, equipment and supplies, and the improvement of the lands to render them habitable and productive. The State shall provide the funds necessary for this purpose and shall conduct operations in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 10, to increase the total appropriation from the reclamation fund from "\$8,943,000" to "\$9,599,000."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would like to ask the Senator from Utah what the total amount of the reclamation fund is?

Mr. SMOOT. About \$9,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The appropriation, I see, amounts to a little more than that.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, we will have some returns coming in right along from the payments. We are not running over the receipts. We are well within bounds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it actively diminishing or increasing?

Mr. SMOOT. Up to the present time, this year, it is a little less than it was before.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Can the Senator tell us what the outlook is?

Mr. SMOOT. We ought to be able to get \$9,000,000 this year.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the payments are increasing?

Mr. SMOOT. The payments have not been increasing of late.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They have not been?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The other revenues are holding up?

Mr. SMOOT. They are just about the same; in fact, I think they are a little more than they were.

Mr. KENDRICK. Can the Senator from Utah tell us whether or not the revenues from all sources are increasing?

Mr. SMOOT. No; as I said to the Senator from Montana, the payments are not increasing materially.

Mr. KENDRICK. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that the payments on the general reclamation fund are about stationary.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope they will be about the same as they were last year. That is what we anticipate. We are running no danger, with the amount of the appropriations we are making in this bill. We will have an ample amount of money to meet the needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Geological Survey," on page 85, line 5, after the word "laws," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$265,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For the examination and classification of lands requisite to the determination of their suitability for enlarged homesteads, stock-raising homesteads, public watering places, and stock driveways, or other uses, as required by the public land laws, \$265,000, of which amount not to exceed \$175,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for the United States Geological Survey from "\$1,637,760" to "\$1,652,760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 87, line 10, after the words "supplies" to insert "including the purchase of cooks' uniforms, goggles, gloves, and such other articles or equipment as may be necessary in the operation of mine rescue cars and stations," so as to read:

For the investigation and improvement of mine rescue and first-aid methods and appliances and the teaching of mine safety, rescue, and first-aid methods, including the exchange in part payment for operation, maintenance, and repair of mine rescue trucks, the construction

of temporary structures and the repair, maintenance, and operation of mine rescue cars and Government-owned mine rescue stations and appurtenances thereto, and including personal services, traveling expenses and subsistence, equipment, and supplies including the purchase of cooks' uniforms, goggles, gloves, and such other articles or equipment as may be necessary in the operation of mine rescue cars and stations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$23,000" and insert "\$28,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

To conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of mineral fuels, and for investigation of mineral fuels belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient utilization, to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy and, upon request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to investigate the fuel-burning equipment in use by or proposed for any of the departments, establishments, or institutions of the United States in the District of Columbia, \$155,000, of which amount not to exceed \$28,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 13, to insert:

For development of oil shale, including construction of necessary plant; purchase, lease, or condemnation of necessary land for erection of plant; purchase or mining of shale, operation of plant, and for all necessary expenses incident thereto, including clerical and technical assistance in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, to be immediately available, \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, an examination of many of the provisions of the bill reveals the fact that very large amounts that are appropriated for investigations of public lands, and so forth, are expended in the District of Columbia. It seems to me that the amount allowed for service in the District of Columbia is entirely disproportionate. For instance, on page 85, line 5, \$265,000 are appropriated "for the examination and classification of lands requisite to the determination of their suitability for enlarged homesteads, stock-raising homesteads, public watering places, and stock driveways, or other uses, as required by the public land laws," and it is provided that of the appropriation of \$265,000 not to exceed \$175,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The employees in the District of Columbia can not go upon the public domain in the West and classify and examine lands and determine suitable watering places and driveways.

If they had allowed \$10,000 or possibly \$15,000 out of the appropriation for employees within the District of Columbia, it seems to me it would have been adequate, but I can not comprehend why \$175,000 as a maximum should be allowed for employees in the District of Columbia out of an appropriation of \$265,000 to look after systems of waterways and public lands in the West.

May I call attention to another item, though there are many others to which I might direct attention. For instance, on page 86 there is an item of \$400,000, which is not so bad, carried for investigations as to the causes of mine explosions, methods of mining, and so forth, of which not to exceed \$58,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, notwithstanding the fact that the Bureau of Mines has a large personnel within the District and large appropriations are carried in the bill for the payment of that enormous personnel.

On page 88, for inquiries and investigations and dissemination of information concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, utilization of petroleum and natural gas, and so forth, an appropriation of \$456,000 is carried, of which not to exceed \$56,200 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia; notwithstanding, I repeat, that the Bureau of Mines and the Interior Department are both equipped with hundreds if not thousands of employees.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that those employees are paid out of this fund and, therefore, as they are here they must be paid; but the House of Representatives and the Senate of late years have put limitations upon the amounts of money in the appropriations that may be expended for employees in the District of Columbia. Upon the face of it, \$175,000 out of \$265,000 for the examination and classification of lands requisite to the determination of their suitability for enlarged homesteads, stock-raising homesteads, public watering places, and so forth, seems large; but I call the Senator's attention

to the fact that almost all the classification in the field has been made.

What I mean to say is that the lands have been reported as lands that are within this classification. Now, the work of getting those lands passed to the applicants for the 640-acre homestead must be done entirely within the District of Columbia. Not only that, but if the survey has been made, then the investigation must be made here not only by representatives of the Land Office, but of the Geological Survey as well, and a great part of that work now, and from now on, in the classification of those lands must be done here in the District of Columbia.

As to the other items to which the Senator referred, for investigation of mine explosions, methods of mining, and so forth, that means that every technical man and every scientist whom the Bureau of Mines has in the District of Columbia working upon this particular examination must be paid out of this \$58,000. They have \$400,000 less the \$58,000 to pay all their other expenses. The House of Representatives thinks that amount ought to be limited and that they should not use more than \$58,000 for this purpose. For the last four or five years it has been the policy of Congress to limit the appropriations as to the amounts that should be expended within the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I notice that has not been done in the next item concerning oil shale. There the entire \$90,000 is appropriated to be expended in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. Not under the wording of the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the way it reads.

Mr. SMOOT. That could be done, of course, but the language of the amendment is—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understood the policy to which the Senator refers, and which is a very wise one, was adopted by reason of the fact that we found that in some way or other these lump-sum appropriations were all spent, or very largely spent, here in the District of Columbia, and so, as the Senator said, the policy was adopted of limiting the amount which could be spent within the District of Columbia. But I notice that is not done with respect to experimentation in the oil-shale fields.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment reads:

For development of oil shale, including construction of necessary plant; purchase, lease, or condemnation of necessary land for erection of plant; purchase or mining of shale, operation of plant, and for all necessary expenses incident thereto, including clerical and technical assistance in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, to be immediately available, \$90,000.

The Senator, I think, will know that the necessary work incident to the establishment of this plant has already been performed in the District of Columbia. The money is for the erection of the plant and for the purchase of the lands, and that is exactly what it will be used for.

I agree with the Senator that after we get this matter all running and after the purchase is made and the plant erected and we know the cost of operation we should put the same provisions on future appropriations for this purpose as we are putting on other items to limit them as to the number of employees and the amount of money to be expended in the District of Columbia. It is a very wise policy.

Mr. KING. I hope Senators from the public-land States will give me their attention just a moment to let me illustrate a little further what I conceive to be the extravagance of the Interior Department and the improper utilization of funds for personal service within the District of Columbia. On page 83, commencing in line 16, is the following item:

For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, including lands in national forests, \$485,000, of which amount not to exceed \$305,900 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Four hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for topographic services and more than \$300,000 of that amount is to be employed to pay employees of the Government in the District of Columbia.

Let me call attention to a few more and then the Senator in charge of the bill can explain them all. On page 84 is this item:

For geologic surveys in the various portions of the United States, \$325,000, of which amount not to exceed \$11,840 may be used for work in volcanology in the Hawaiian Islands and not to exceed \$272,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

In other words, \$325,000 is appropriated for geologic surveys and yet of that amount \$272,700 may be expended for personal

services in the District of Columbia. As I have said twice before, we have furnished a very large personnel for the Interior Department.

The next item on page 84 is as follows:

For chemical and physical researches relating to the geology of the United States, including researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts, \$40,000, of which amount not to exceed \$36,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

That leaves \$4,000 for investigation of the public domain to determine if there are any deposits of potash.

Another item commencing in line 12, on the same page 84, is as follows:

For continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, \$72,000, to be available immediately, of which amount not to exceed \$47,400 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

More than one-half of the appropriation to determine the mineral resources of Alaska, perhaps with the purpose of inducing settlement, is to be expended in the District of Columbia.

Continuing on the same page, line 16:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, \$165,000, of which amount not to exceed \$71,730 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

I presume that to gauge streams and to determine the water supply and the underground currents and artesian wells will require that the public lands shall be visited. They can not sit in the District of Columbia in one of their offices and determine those questions, and yet of the appropriation of \$165,000 carried in the bill, nearly one-half is devoted to the payment of salaries of employees in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is it not a fact that the provision is a limitation? It is not necessary that the amount specified shall be spent in the District, but not exceeding that amount is to be spent there.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator if he approves of a limitation which permits in some instances three-fourths of the appropriation, and in this instance nearly one-half of the appropriation, to be spent in the District of Columbia?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the limitation feature is very proper. I think it should be limited.

Mr. KING. I grant that; but does the Senator approve of a limitation which absorbs in many instances three-quarters of the entire appropriation?

Mr. FLETCHER. It makes it possible, but does not oblige them to spend all the amount named. It says they shall not spend more than that amount.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think such a limitation is an invitation?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am inclined to think that perhaps most of that which is permissible will be spent in the District of Columbia. I am not sure about that. It is a matter of administration. It ought not to be done unless necessary.

Mr. KING. I think if the Senator will visit the Interior Department, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and other bureaus of the Government, he will find the crowded and congested condition resulting from the enormous number of employees will not vindicate the wisdom of a provision that leaves the limitation at such a high figure.

Let me go a little further. On page 85 is this item:

For preparation of the reports of the mineral resources of the United States, including special statistical inquiries as to production, distribution, and consumption of the essential minerals, \$123,000, of which amount not to exceed \$94,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

I concede with respect to that item that there is a little more justification for the very large expenditure within the District of Columbia, but to spend \$94,000 for employees' salaries within the District out of an appropriation of \$123,000 relating to the preparation of reports of the mineral resources of the United States is entirely too much.

All through the bill will be found appropriations which in my judgment are entirely too great made for employees within the District of Columbia. I should be very glad if the Senator having the bill in charge would consent to an amendment limiting the amount that may be expended in these various items to which attention has been called to a very much lower figure than that named in the bill. I do not want to

delay the passage of the bill, but I do challenge attention to what I conceive to be an evil, and an invitation to the employees of the Government and to these bureaus to spend extravagant amounts within the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would not like to agree to any amendment applicable to any of these items, but really it does seem to me as though some very satisfactory explanation ought to be made to the Senate of what seems really scandalous in respect to a number of these items.

Mr. SMOOT. Take the last item to which the Senator from Utah just referred, which is \$94,000 out of \$123,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is quite obvious that a great part of that work will be done in the District of Columbia. That seems all right.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. That involves the preparation of reports. For instance, we will go back to the item to which the Senator has just called attention.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Take the item on page 84, beginning in line 12, which provides:

For continuation of the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska, \$72,000, to be available immediately, of which amount not to exceed \$47,400 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

How can that possibly be justified?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that the men who are doing this work spend a part of their time in the field and a part of the time in Washington. They are sent into the field to make the investigation; they collect the minerals, examine the formations, and then they come here to Washington, where they prepare their reports. In many cases half of their time is spent in the District of Columbia.

The question as to whether or not the appropriation is too large is another question, but we have cut these appropriations down, though the departments are asking for more all the time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Utah will understand that I am making no criticism whatever of the amount of the appropriation. I am simply referring to the distribution of the expenditure of the money. Take the next item, for instance, which provides:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, \$165,000, of which amount not to exceed \$71,730 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the same explanation applies to that item. There is a gauger in every State upon every principal stream. Men are sent there from time to time. We do not have men gauging the streams all the time; sometimes a local man does that work; but the man who prepares the report, the man who collates the information and puts it in such shape that it may be understood and may be of real value must be a man who knows his business. That man comes here to Washington. His work is done here, being based upon the reports that are made as to the flow of the stream, the amount of water, and so on. That is the reason these appropriations are distributed in the manner provided, and I do not feel that they could be distributed in any better manner than is now done.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator if the sums which it is provided may be expended in the District of Columbia from year to year are really expended here?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that they almost always are so expended.

Mr. GEORGE. In other words, they expend as much as they can in the District under the method of distribution provided.

Mr. SMOOT. There may be cases where they do not, but I will say that generally these sums are expended. I will say that before any of these restrictive provisions were put into the appropriation bills a greater proportion of the appropriations were spent in the District of Columbia by far than is now spent under these restrictions.

I think that limitation has been really a splendid thing, but we do not want to limit the expenditures to such a point that we can not get reports which may be relied upon by the people of the United States, as would be the case if we prevented the men who really have to prepare the reports, who are capable of making the reports, and have the information to compile them from coming to the District of Columbia to do the work.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is a very difficult thing for a layman to comprehend how it costs as much money to pre-

pare a report as it costs to go out into the field and do the work on which the report is based.

Mr. SMOOT. It depends altogether upon what kind of a report it may be.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not care what kind of report it may be.

Mr. SMOOT. Take, for instance, the item providing for "the investigation of the mineral resources of Alaska." To go out in Alaska and see a coal bed there and form a judgment as to the amount of coal that may be there is not going to take as long as to prepare the report setting forth all the facts and details and the reasons why the judgment of the investigator is formed.

Mr. GEORGE. I have an impression that it will take a long time to complete the report when the work can be done here in the city of Washington and a large portion of the appropriation for the specific work may be expended within the District.

Mr. SMOOT. I will assure the Senator that the Appropriations Committee are not eager to have employees of the Government who are required to work in the field come to Washington. In fact, that practice grew to such an extent that Congress had to protect itself by limiting the amount that could be expended in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GEORGE. In the case of field work and investigations of the character indicated in a number of these appropriations it is most difficult for me to see how it would ever be necessary or proper for at least one-half of the amount appropriated to be expended in the District of Columbia in tabulation, formulating reports, and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. More than half of the time would be required to be spent here.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The appropriation in this instance is \$165,000, and the bill reads:

of which amount not to exceed \$71,730 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

I will call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that less than half of the amount may be expended in the District of Columbia; the remainder of it is to be spent for field work.

Mr. GEORGE. What I have in mind, Mr. President, is this: For instance, in the appropriations for eradicating or controlling the boll weevil by the use of arsenic poison, if the authorities are permitted to expend approximately half of the total amount in the District of Columbia I can very well understand how the work of controlling the boll weevil will progress. Of course that item is not in this bill, but I use it as an illustration.

Mr. SMOOT. Nor is that in any way, shape, or form comparable to any item that has been mentioned here to-night. In that case the work has to be done on the ground; the arsenic has to be applied in the cotton field; the agents of the department have to be on the ground. There is no question but what the boll weevil is there, and there is no question that if an effort is going to be made to destroy it the poison has to be applied, and applied in the way which has been demonstrated to be the best way.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator what about mineral surveys in Alaska—the coal surveys, for instance?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator or I could go up into Alaska and pass upon the mineral resources of Alaska. I could not do so. I could say whether there was a copper stain somewhere, but I would not know anything about whether there was a vein there, and I could not give the reasons why I thought there was if I did think so.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask my colleague whether he could find out what the mineral resources of Alaska were if he remained in Washington. In that event he would have to rely upon hearsay evidence.

Mr. SMOOT. But if I should go to Alaska and should spend part of my time there, and then could come back here and prepare my report, where I could have the office space and the assistance which I needed, which I could avail myself of immediately, but which I could not get in Alaska, it would be profitable for me to come back here to prepare that report. None of these reports, of course, are made in Washington without a field survey first having been undertaken; that would be impossible.

Mr. GEORGE. The thing that impresses me most is that it takes so long a time and so much money to prepare and submit a report of what is done.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that not only in this particular case but in others the proceedings may appear to be expensive to the taxpayer, but I want also to say that nearly everything undertaken by the Government is done in the same way.

Mr. GEORGE. If anything like the same proportion of ordinary appropriations—for instance, those for the control of the boll weevil and other agricultural pests—is required to be spent in the District of Columbia, I could begin to understand some things that have heretofore been very mysterious to me.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know of any such practice being followed in the case of the efforts to exterminate the boll weevil. Let me say to the Senator, however, that the man who is qualified to go to Alaska and pass upon the mineral resources of Alaska must be a high-priced man, and when he has completed his surveys on the ground it is just as well for him to spend the time in the District of Columbia, where everything is prepared for him, as to undertake to formulate his reports in Alaska and try to do that branch of the work there.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator is correct in that, I do not think there ought to be a limitation that not more than one-half of the amount can be expended in the District of Columbia. Why not let them spend it all here?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator knows there is no necessity for that.

Mr. GEORGE. Why not let them make the full investigation here?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator knows that an investigation, for instance, of the mineral resources of Alaska could not be made without an agent being there on the ground.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I apprehend, and I am simply saying that, on the face of it, it does seem curious that so large a portion of the appropriation should be expended in the District of Columbia, if it be true that, in fact, so much as is allowed is usually expended in the District. I thought, perhaps, that not so much was expended here each year as the law allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, I think the amount allowed is pretty well expended up to the limit.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Senator from Utah and I both have received letters in regard to the gauging of streams. Each State cooperates with the Government in that work.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in every case.

Mr. OVERMAN. My information is—and the Senator has the same information that I have—that the Government is not doing its full share.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there are demands for larger appropriations on the part of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. But all of the appropriations are not used for the primary purpose, because, for instance, \$71,000 of the item for gauging streams is allowed for expenses in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT. All the reports of the States in regard to the gauging of streams come here to Washington. That is a work of collaboration. Reports have to be made upon it, and whatever is done in the States and whatever is done by the Government is all consolidated.

Mr. OVERMAN. But nearly half of the appropriation may be expended in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question for information as to the item on page 84, to which the Senator from North Carolina has just referred. That item reads as follows:

For gauging streams and determining the water supply of the United States, the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells, and the preparation of reports upon the best methods of utilizing the water resources, \$165,000, of which amount not to exceed \$71,730 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

That provides just in an offhand way—of course I can not be accurate in my estimate—for a bureau of something like 35 or 40 clerks. As I recall, this item has been in every appropriation bill since I have been in Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it has.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, why is it that we have got to have a continuing bureau, year in and year out, to report on a matter of this kind? If 35 men could get the information and report it in one year, it would be wise to provide the amount of \$71,730. That, however, is not the thing that bothers me at all. What bothers me is that we should keep this continuing bureau here, year after year, when certainly within two years they could find out substantially all about the water resources

of the country and secure all the statistics that might be needed.

The work is duplicated, I think, in other departments. I should like to have some explanation of that.

Mr. SMOOT. If I had the telegrams here which have come to me, I think I could find among them a telegram from the governor or some other official of Tennessee complaining that this appropriation is not sufficient. I know the Senator from North Carolina has received such telegrams, and I have received at least a dozen asking the Committee on Appropriations to increase the amount beyond \$165,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. The States carry on this work in conjunction with the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the States cooperate with the Government in the work. If I wanted to know the flow of the Weber River in my State for the last 30 years, how would I find it? I could find it in the department. The department is working in connection with the States; every year the streams are being gauged, and every year the reports are prepared.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask my good friend of the committee one further question. In his long experience in this body has he ever known of any one of these bureaus of the Government anywhere at any time that has been discontinued after it has once been put into operation, however temporary it might at the time have been thought to be?

Mr. SMOOT. I can call to mind some that were created during the war that have been discontinued, but I was just trying to run back over some of the others.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to know some of these war bureaus, even, that have been discontinued.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, of course, there were a great many of those.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not very many. They still have a little nucleus. Even the Railroad Administration has a large organization still existing.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is left. I do not think it will exist very much longer, though.

Mr. McKELLAR. It ought not to exist, and it ought not to have existed for the last several years.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let us go on.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the reading is resumed I want to make a statement.

I am entirely dissatisfied with the attitude of the committee respecting the appropriations to which attention has been called. I think it is manifestly unfair to the taxpayers and to the Government to allow such a large proportion of these appropriations to be expended in the District of Columbia. I shall not tender any amendment; but I give notice now that when Congress convenes again I shall ask by resolution for a detailed account from all of the departments where these expenditures are involved, showing what disposition has been made of the funds carried, and I shall ask also and introduce a resolution for an investigation of the Interior Department, with a view to determining just what use is being made of the funds, and whether adequate results are being obtained for the millions and tens of millions of dollars which go to that department.

I may say, in passing, that opposition was registered by the President of the United States to the investigation of the Treasury Department. A committee has been investigating the Treasury Department. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] is chairman of the committee, and I am sure that the work which is being done will prove of a constructive character and will be of very great advantage to the Government. If we had committees in the Senate to investigate the various departments—committees such as we had before the rules were changed—and those committees would function as they ought to function, then tab could be kept constantly upon the appropriations to the various departments and the activities of the departments, with a view to determining whether adequate results were being obtained for the appropriations made.

Certainly, however, the large appropriations which are made to the Interior Department call for further information than we are receiving; and I give notice that at the next session I shall offer a resolution for the investigation of these appropriations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, without any desire to prolong this discussion, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether there can be found in the record any statement from any of the officers of the department preparing

these estimates of the facts which will show the justification, not for the total appropriation but for the distribution?

Take the item to which reference has been made, at the top of page 85. Will the record show us why it is necessary to spend \$175,000 in the District of Columbia out of an appropriation of \$265,000 for classifying lands?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to get the information in detail, I will refer him to the Interior Department appropriation bill of 1926, the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, and on page 175 is the heading, "Personal services in the District of Columbia," beginning with each item in the bill and telling the reasons for it. The House went into every item of the bill and had Mr. Smith, or the head of the bureau or the division in which the appropriation was to be expended, before the committee to explain to the committee why the amount was wanted for employment in the District of Columbia. If it were not so late, I would take up the items at this time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not desire to have that done. I wanted to know, however, whether the information is in the record.

Mr. SMOOT. It is complete and full as to every single item. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines from "\$1,881,560" to "\$1,971,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Parks," on page 96, line 25, after the word "improvement," to strike out "\$11,920; for auto camps, including comfort stations, \$6,000; in all, \$17,920," and insert "establishment of auto camps and comfort stations, \$17,920," so as to read:

Platt National Park, Okla.: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, establishment of auto camps and comfort stations, \$17,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 6, before the word "for," to strike out "\$5,100" and insert "\$6,600," so as to read:

Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$6,600 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$8,400 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the east boundary, not exceeding \$7,500 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the south boundary, and including feed for buffalo and other animals and salaries of buffalo keepers, \$384,503; for construction of physical improvements, \$31,497, including not exceeding \$20,297 for extension of sewers and sanitary systems and garbage-disposal facilities, not exceeding \$10,000 for auto camps, and not exceeding \$1,200 for the construction of buildings; in all, \$396,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories, Territory of Alaska," on page 107, after line 14, to insert:

For installation of oil-burning equipment and everything necessary and incident thereto in governor's residence, Juneau, Alaska, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah presents an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 3, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to fix the rates of compensation of civilian employees in the field services under the Department of the Interior to correspond, so far as may be practicable, to the rates established by the classification act of 1923 for positions in the departmental services in the District of Columbia, notwithstanding the salary restrictions in other acts which limit salaries to rates in conflict with the rates fixed by the classification act of 1923 for the departmental services.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 82, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

That under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior the reclamation of arid lands, under the act of June 17, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, shall be administered by a commissioner of reclamation, who shall be equipped for the duties of said office by practical experience in irrigation of arid lands and the agricultural development and utilization thereof, and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first commissioner appointed under the provisions of this paragraph shall receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have some explanation of this amendment. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] can give it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from New Mexico is not interested in this. It is another amendment.

Mr. KING. I thought it was this.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I will say that these amendments have all been authorized by the committee by a unanimous vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 99, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$21,980" and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Forty-six thousand nine hundred and eighty dollars, of which amount \$25,000 shall be immediately available for the administration, protection, maintenance, and construction of physical improvements of Carlsbad Cave National Monument in New Mexico whenever the State of New Mexico shall surrender title to section 36, township 24 south, range 24 east, to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think I had better offer a word of explanation before sending up the next amendment, because it has been changed somewhat since the full committee authorized the chairman of the subcommittee to report it to the Senate.

The amendment which I have in mind and which I am just going to offer is an appropriation for Howard University. There is no question about the appropriations with the exception of one item, and that is an appropriation "toward the construction of a building for the medical department, within a limit of cost of \$370,000, which is hereby authorized, \$185,000," with a proviso.

I was led to believe, and I did not take time to examine carefully, that the Budget had made an estimate for this appropriation. After an examination as late as this evening I find that the Budget did not make an estimate for this appropriation, but did make an estimate for the balance of the appropriations for Howard University, and there is no objection to the balance. Therefore, as I am informed that a point of order will be made against this item, and that point of order was sustained at the last session of Congress, I am not going to ask the Senate to adopt the item at this time, although I want to say, that personally, I should very much like to see it done; but I shall offer the amendment as I send it to the desk now, eliminating the part for the construction of the medical building.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, what harm would it do, if the point of order is to be raised, if this were to be included in it?

Mr. OVERMAN. Because, Mr. President, we had a contest over that matter, and the Senate overruled the President of the Senate and threw it out, and it was thrown out in the House; and there is no use in making that fight again when it has been rejected by both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not that true of the rest of the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 111, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice, and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid

from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than \$2,200 shall be used for normal instruction, \$125,000;

For tools, material, salaries of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, of which amount not to exceed \$21,800 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$34,000;

Medical department: For part cost needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, \$9,000;

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, biological, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the science hall, including cases and shelving, \$5,000;

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, \$3,000;

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, \$30,000;

Fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, \$15,000;

Total, Howard University, \$221,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, what becomes of the last clause?

Mr. SMOOT. I say, the point of order will be made against it, and it has not been estimated for. I have just made the explanation.

Mr. WATSON. None of us over here could hear what was said. Would the point of order lie against the \$185,000?

Mr. SMOOT. The point of order lies against that because of the fact that the Budget has made no estimate for it.

Mr. WATSON. Did not the Budget estimate for the \$185,000 but not for the remainder of the \$370,000?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am informed that they made no estimate whatever for that.

Mr. OVERMAN. The House refused to put it in, and there is no estimate whatever for all of those items.

Mr. WATSON. The House always refuses to put it in, and the Senate always puts it in. It is obnoxious to the House rules, because it has never been legislated for.

Mr. SMOOT. A point of order would lie against it, and I do not want this bill sent back to the committee, and a point of order would do that; and I prefer to take it out, because I have no doubt that we would have to yield on it, as we did a year ago, even after we voted it in.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, does the Senator intend later to bring in an amendment dealing with this matter, or what does he purpose doing with it?

Mr. SMOOT. Not in this bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It will have to be authorized first by law.

Mr. SMOOT. It would have to be estimated by the Budget. Then we could offer it as an amendment to any other bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator anticipate that it will be examined into by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. I hope so; but I can not say whether they will make an estimate for it or not. I will say to the Senator that I am in favor of it.

Now just a word of explanation before I offer these three amendments, because they are practically the same, except that they relate to three reclamation projects.

All the appropriations in the bill for reclamation projects provide that the last deficiency appropriation act which carried an appropriation for them should be extended, if the amounts were not expended by June 30 of this year, until June 30, 1926. Of course, it would be impossible to expend the money by the 30th of June of this year. Therefore the appropriations are to be extended for one year. As I have said, all the appropriations for all the projects provided for in the pending bill are extended until June 30, with the exception of these three, and I offer amendments to extend the time for the three projects named.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The READING CLERK. On page 75, after line 16, insert:

Owyhee irrigation project, Oregon: The unexpended balance, if any, remaining at the close of the fiscal year 1925 from the appropriation of \$315,000 made by the act referred to as the "second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924," approved December 5, 1924 (Public, No. 292), for continued investigations, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, Owyhee irrigation project, Oregon, is hereby reappropriated, to be available and to continue available for use during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the next amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 80, after the word "lands," in line 10, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the unexpended balance, if any, remaining at the close of the fiscal year 1925 from the appropriation of \$375,000 made

by the act referred to as the "second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924," approved December 5, 1924 (Public No. 292), for continued investigation, commencement of construction of the Kittitas unit, and incidental operations, Yakima project, Washington, is hereby reappropriated, to be available and to continue available for use during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 80, after line 18, insert:

The unexpended balance, if any, remaining at the close of the fiscal year 1925 from the appropriation of \$125,000 made by the act referred to as the "second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924," approved December 5, 1924 (Public No. 292, page 15, 68th Congress), for cooperative investigations of the feasibility of reclamation projects, including the Guernsey Reservoir of the North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming, the Spanish Springs project in Nevada, the Owyhee and Vale projects in Oregon, projects in the Salt Lake Basin of Utah, the Kittitas division of the Yakima project in Washington, and the Casper-Alcova project in Wyoming; including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase, repair, maintenance, hire and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, fiscal year 1925, is hereby reappropriated to be available and to continue available for use during the fiscal year 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now that those several amendments offered by the Senator from Utah have been agreed to, I want to ask him how many of them were recommended by the Budget?

Mr. SMOOT. All of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. All those amendments?

Mr. SMOOT. Every one of them?

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 94, line 25, strike out the words "comprehensive sewage disposal," and on page 95, line 1, the word "system," and insert in lieu thereof the words "septic tank."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 80, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 80, between lines 16 and 17, insert:

Umatilla Rapids project, Oregon: For investigation of the feasibility of irrigation by gravity or pumping, water sources, water storage, and related problems on the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for cooperative and miscellaneous investigations of the feasibility of reclamation projects, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and incidental expenses, the unexpended balance of this appropriation contained in the act of March 4, 1923 (42d Stat. L. p. 1540), is hereby reappropriated and made immediately available until used.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 75, after line 19, insert:

Vale project, Oregon: For continued investigations, purchase of storage not exceeding \$200,000, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the totals may be changed in conformity with any amendments which have been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerks will be authorized to make the necessary changes.

Mr. HOWELL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 23, line 3, after the word "exceed," strike out the figure "\$1,500" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "\$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The READING CLERK. On page 23, lines 4 and 5—

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the balance of the amendments, but I do not want the appropriation of \$1,500 increased, because that has been already agreed to by everybody who said anything to me about it, with the exception of one man.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon be again read at the desk. It was impossible to hear the reading of it. I understand it was agreed to, but I want to know something about it. The Senate is entitled to understand the proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks that the last amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon may be read. The Secretary will read.

The READING CLERK. On page 75, after line 19, the Senator from Oregon proposes to insert:

Vale project, Oregon: For continued investigations, purchase of storage not exceeding \$200,000, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, \$500,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am not at this time moving a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, but I will do so unless an explanation of it is given. This is apparently an individual amendment, not authorized by the committee, which appropriates \$500,000, and not a Senator, outside perhaps of the Senator who offered the amendment, knows anything about it. During the reading of the amendment it was a physical impossibility for a Senator giving the best attention of which he was capable to know what the amendment provided.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I realize the confusion and the Senator's inability to hear what was going on.

Mr. ROBINSON. No one could hear; it was no individual difficulty on my part.

Mr. WARREN. I realize that, of course. This is a matter which has been considered. It comes from the Budget, and it has been considered by the Committee on Appropriations. It was left out of the bill in the House through a misunderstanding, and it is expected to go in this bill in the Senate. A provision covering this item was passed through the Senate last year in the second deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. How did it happen that it was not embraced in the bill reported to the Senate by the Senate committee?

Mr. WARREN. The proposition as at first made was to put the item into the deficiency bill. This is an appropriation for a project which is already established, and this is to appropriate money to add to it. The expense will come in 1926 instead of 1925, and so, instead of putting the item into the deficiency bill on which they have been working in the House to-day, we have offered to put it into this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Apparently that is just what the committee did not do, and that is what I am inquiring about. The Senator from Oregon offers it as an individual amendment. I am asking the Senator now why the committee did not report it if it has the status which the Senator has just said it has.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator overlooks the fact that the House is now considering the deficiency bill—

Mr. ROBINSON. Did the Senate Committee on Appropriations consider the project and the amendment which the Senator from Oregon has just had agreed to?

Mr. WARREN. It did.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then I ask the Senator again if the Senate Committee on Appropriations was favorable to the amendment, why it did not report it in the bill?

Mr. WARREN. Because it was taken up after the bill had been reported to the Senate, assuming that it might go into the other bill. When it was left out of that it was decided to put it into this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. It did not come to the Committee on Appropriations until after the committee had reported the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. It did not.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is, then, a committee amendment?

Mr. WARREN. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The READING CLERK. On page 23, line 4, after the word "governor," to strike out "and each of said tribal attorneys" and in lieu thereof insert:

except in the case of tribal attorneys whose expenses shall be determined and limited by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the same amendment which was offered to the bill a year ago. It only had reference to the attorneys of those two tribes, and I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, I offer three amendments, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma offers the following amendments, which the Secretary will read in their order.

The READING CLERK. At the bottom of page 62, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

For the purpose of construction of a road across Government reservation in Latimer County, Okla., leading to the Government sanitarium on Buffalo Mountain, \$7,806.10.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that has not been estimated for by the Budget.

Mr. HARRELD. I know it has not been, but this estimate has just reached me. It has been made by a Government surveyor. The Government owns a sanitarium on Buffalo Mountain, and it is absolutely inaccessible. The Government owns the reservation over which the road goes, and at the request of the superintendent of the sanitarium this estimate was made. The survey was made by a Government surveyor, and I did not get to the committee with it because I have just received it. It is really an emergency, and if the Senator could let it go in I would like to take it up with the department. I am sorry I did not have an opportunity to present the matter to the committee, but I have just received this information.

Mr. SMOOT. I will have to make a point of order against it, and then we can see about it. There are other bills to be passed; and if the Senator can get an estimate for it, it will be all right, but I am compelled to make a point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah makes a point of order against the amendment, and the point of order is sustained. The Secretary will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The READING CLERK. At the bottom of page 62, insert:

For the construction of $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles of highway within the Chillico Indian School Reserve, Chillico, Okla., \$100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I will have to make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. HARRELD. May I make a statement as to the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRELD. The amendment provides for a stretch of road which is the only unimproved portion in a hard-surface highway across the State of Oklahoma. That stretch is about three miles and a half long and is about the only link left to complete a hard-surface road running north and south across the State. It runs through the Indian reservation, on which there is a school attended now by 825 Indian pupils. It is purely a Government reservation, and that road is absolutely needed.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether the Senator contemplates that the State shall make some contribution toward the construction of this road?

Mr. HARRELD. The State can not make any contribution because it is on a Government reservation, and it is the only missing link in 100 miles of hard-surface road.

Mr. KING. As I understand, these appropriations which are made for highways through the States which are denominated "State highways," where the Government makes contribution, the Government and the State make certain proportional appropriations regardless of the locus of the road.

Mr. HARRELD. That is not true in our State of roads that cross a Government reservation.

Mr. SMOOT. I will have to make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the item has not been estimated for and has not been reported by a standing committee; so the point of order must be sustained. The Clerk will state the next amendment, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD].

The READING CLERK. On page 46, line 5, after the numeral "\$20,000," insert the words "to be immediately available," so as to read:

Sequoyah Orphan Training School, near Tahlequah, Okla.: For the orphan Indian children of the State of Oklahoma belonging to the restricted class, to be conducted as an industrial school under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$59,850; for repairs and improvements, \$6,500; for the enlargement of the school building so as to provide four additional classrooms, not to exceed \$20,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I confess I am very much disappointed over the proposed appropriation for Howard University Medical School. I know from the statement of the Senator in charge of the bill he favors it, too. I wonder if we might not have some assurance that the Budget Bureau will be stimulated to make an examination so that provision will be made for it in the future?

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to take it up with General Lord, Director of the Budget. I hope he will make the estimate, but I do not want the Interior Department appropriation bill sent back to the committee, so I am not going to offer it as an amendment, because I know that a point of order would be made against it, and then it would all have to go back to the committee.

Mr. COPELAND. I am quite satisfied with the statement of the Senator in charge of the bill that every effort will be made to make provision later for the appropriation. I have no disposition, of course, to press the matter now, because I do not want to have the bill endangered either, but I am very glad to have his assurance, because we should provide the money to make it possible for Howard University to go on with its medical school.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments to be offered as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 6 (legislative day of January 5), 1925

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles F. Parsons, of Hawaii, to be United States attorney, district of Hawaii, vice William T. Carden, deceased.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Passed Assistant Surgeon Robert W. Hart to be surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 30, 1925. This officer has passed the necessary examination required by law.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William M. Pugh to be postmaster at Red Bay, Ala., in place of S. D. Wren. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

Charles W. Horn to be postmaster at Brantley, Ala., in place of J. W. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

Culver M. Hillis to be postmaster at Athens, Ala., in place of R. M. Rawls. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

William H. Briley to be postmaster at Ariton, Ala., in place of W. H. Briley. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

Samuel L. Thetford to be postmaster at Boligee, Ala., in place of M. H. Johnston, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Albert N. Colgrove to be postmaster at Waterbury, Conn., in place of James Geddes, resigned.

GEORGIA

Albert N. Tumlin to be postmaster at Cave Spring, Ga., in place of Emma Pettis. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1923.

IDAHO

Swen F. Johnson to be postmaster at Downey, Idaho, in place of William Laurensen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

ILLINOIS

Ruby D. Gibson to be postmaster at Mason, Ill., in place of R. W. Gibson, deceased.

INDIANA

LeRoy H. McAllister to be postmaster at New Carlisle, Ind., in place of Charles Bates. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

Fred H. Maddox to be postmaster at Lyons, Ind., in place of F. M. Harwood, deceased.

Walter M. Skinner to be postmaster at Fulton, Ind., in place of H. R. Henderson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Walker Jameson to be postmaster at Beattyville, Ky., in place of C. B. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1923.

MARYLAND

Roland M. White to be postmaster at Princess Anne, Md., in place of E. B. Polk. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1923.

S. Stanley Bender to be postmaster at Kitzmiller, Md., in place of A. M. Lyon, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elsa L. Downing to be postmaster at Harding, Mass., in place of H. E. Hotchkiss, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Myrtle G. Lewis to be postmaster at Burr Oak, Mich., in place of G. F. Hackman. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1924.

Edgar Rashleigh to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of J. J. Byers, resigned.

MISSOURI

Ray Streeter to be postmaster at Sturgeon, Mo., in place of F. F. Hulett. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

Dorsey F. Waggoner to be postmaster at Brownington, Mo., in place of A. M. Dunning. Office became third class April 1, 1924.

MONTANA

Albert M. Stevenson to be postmaster at Lodgegrass, Mont., in place of J. W. Cornwell, removed.

NEBRASKA

Clifton C. Brittell to be postmaster at Gresham, Nebr., in place of S. A. Tobey. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

NEW JERSEY

William L. Scheuerman to be postmaster at Basking Ridge, N. J., in place of W. L. Scheuerman. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

NEW YORK

John W. Parkhurst to be postmaster at Pulaski, N. Y., in place of G. W. Morton, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Miles S. Elliott to be postmaster at Edenton, N. C., in place of M. F. Bond. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Lorenzo D. Maney to be postmaster at Biltmore, N. C., in place of C. M. McCall, deceased.

OHIO

Plummer D. Folk to be postmaster at Leipsic, Ohio, in place of O. T. Place. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924.

OKLAHOMA

Ella M. Harding to be postmaster at Pryor, Okla., in place of L. D. Harding, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William S. Livengood to be postmaster at Meyersdale, Pa., in place of J. T. Shipley. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

Louis S. Bisky to be postmaster at Meshoppen, Pa., in place of L. S. Bisky. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

Charles O. Smith to be postmaster at Black Lick, Pa., in place of E. D. Stoneback. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

J. Laurence Miller to be postmaster at Lopez, Pa., in place of M. E. Collins, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Richard P. Poore to be postmaster at Belton, S. C., in place of H. A. Littlejohn. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1924.

TEXAS

John T. White to be postmaster at Kirkland, Tex., in place of W. H. D. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1924.

VIRGINIA

E. Blanche Tomes to be postmaster at Basic, Va., in place of Z. C. Gold. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924. Benjamin T. Culbertson to be postmaster at Dungannon, Va., in place of J. S. Castle, removed.

WASHINGTON

Harry A. Mykrantz to be postmaster at Twisp, Wash., in place of F. E. Tuttle, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 6 (legislative day of January 5), 1925

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Albert B. Anderson to be circuit judge, seventh circuit.

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Myrtle A. Schreiber, New Palestine.

KANSAS

Henry A. Cory, Alta Vista.
Clarence T. Taylor, Arlington.
Ella W. Mendenhall, Ashland.
Fred H. Bartlett, Baxter Springs.
Verney C. Wallar, Caney.
Henry N. Van Doren, Deerfield.
Guy W. Bryan, Delia.
George H. Leisenring, Ellis.
Glen D. Rose, Eureka.
Fred J. Smith, Galena.
Harry W. Bouck, Girard.
Robert F. Tyler, Moline.
Robert H. Montgomery, Oswego.
Clara G. McNulty, Stockton.
Frank H. Shearer, Wilmore.

MICHIGAN

Agnes B. Ruttle, Carsonville.
Irene M. Wealch, Rapid City.
Florence R. Woodbridge, Sidnaw.
James L. Blakeley, Standish.

MINNESOTA

Joseph L. Gilson, Ivanhoe.
Niels F. Petersen, Tyler.
Mae C. McDonald, Warroad.

MONTANA

Alma M. Engle, Somers.
William Fraser, Three Forks.

NEBRASKA

Laurence N. Merwin, Beaver City.
Archie E. Cates, Beemer.
Marcus H. Carman, Cook.
Joe G. Crews, Culbertson.
Charles H. Fueston, Dakota City.
William C. Coupland, Elgin.
Lucy L. Mendenhall, Elk Creek.
Charles E. Cook, Franklin.
Heinrich D. Friesen, Henderson.
James J. Green, Moorefield.
Herbert L. Wichman, Norfolk.
George A. Ayer, Oxford.
Elizabeth Rucker, Steele City.
Lulu C. Brown, Stockville.
Franz J. Riesland, Wood River.

NEW JERSEY

John R. Yates, Bivalve.

NEW YORK

John A. Crager, Hagaman.
Henry I. Brenzel, Red Hook.

TENNESSEE

Grosvenor M. Steele, Bemis.
Herbert D. Miller, Christiana.
Emma R. Kilgore, Cottagegrove.
Sampson DeRossett, Crossville.
Roe Austin, Dover.
Stephen Hixson, Dunlap.
Link Monday, Kimberlin Heights.

Matthew C. Bratten, Liberty.
Henry M. May, McEwen.
John N. Clouse, Monterey.
Prior T. Livesay, Sneedville.
Carrie S. Honeycutt, Wartburg.

UTAH

Joseph Odell, Logan.
Warren W. Porter, Morgan.
John E. Lunt, Nephi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 6, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord God omnipotent reigneth and holy, holy, holy is His name. We thank Thee that the very heavens stoop to our needs and supply our comfort. This day give vigor to every pure thought and encouragement to every good aspiration. Help us in every way to subdue false ambition and to defeat purposes of greed and prejudice among men. Encourage us to arouse and make alive every duty which gives sanctity to home, stability to society, and permanence to the tenets of representative government. In every effort to spread the kingdom of righteousness, justice, and truth, give us help, O Lord, to stand and falter not, to hope and fear not, to trust Thee and never be dismayed. We pause and bear upon the breath of our prayer a sigh for that Member whose boy has left this world. Come to the support of the stricken ones and give them sweet peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MCKENZIE, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the gentleman from Maine, Mr. NELSON, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 62) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, the establishment of judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3733. An act to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings and to enable it accept the devise and bequest contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick; and

S. 3792. An act to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3792. An act to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESENT FINANCIAL CONDITION AND ADMINISTRATION IN PORTO RICO

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Commissioner FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA on the present financial condition and administration in Porto Rico. I will say that this article, as prepared by the Commissioner, is taken from departmental records and I think it will be found to be authoritative.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say this was Governor Towner's article?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. No. It is an article prepared by the Commissioner from Porto Rico stating the financial and administration conditions in Porto Rico, but is matter taken from departmental sources.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The Commissioner is a Member of this House?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes; the Commissioner is a Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit an article by Commissioner FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA on the present financial condition and administration in Porto Rico. I will say that this article, as prepared by the Commissioner, is taken from departmental records, and I think it will be found to be authoritative.

The article is as follows:

PORTO RICO CONDITIONS CRITICS WRONG, OFFICIAL HERE ASSERTS—RESIDENT COMMISSIONER GIVES FULL STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SITUATION TO PROVE CLAIMS

Recent charges seriously reflecting on the political and economic conditions in Porto Rico were vigorously denied yesterday by Resident Commissioner FELIX CORDOVA DAVILA. In this respect the Resident Commissioner is in full accord with Gov. Horace M. Towner, whose arrival in Washington during the coming week will again direct public attention to Porto Rico.

In his statement yesterday the Resident Commissioner said that public opinion in the United States has not infrequently been misinformed about conditions prevailing on the island.

"Any person coming from there, no matter how unimportant"—

Said Judge DAVILA—

"seems to have access to the American press for the purpose of discrediting us, yet there seems to be little inclination to tell about the constructive work that is constantly going on. This unwarranted criticism of island affairs is in fact nothing more than a severe indictment of the American administration during the last 25 years, and in this connection it is only proper to bear in mind the statement made recently by the Secretary of War before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions to the effect that 'no country in the world has made the remarkable progress that Porto Rico has in a quarter of a century.'

PROGRESS REMARKABLE

"It is strictly true that the progress made by Porto Rico under the American administration is recognized as remarkable by everyone familiar with the facts. Nor has it been equalled by any people anywhere in the world in the same length of time. This is a record creditable alike to the Porto Ricans and to the American administration, and while much is due to the spirit of American institutions and the efforts of the American Government, it should be remembered that nothing could have been accomplished without the people of the island entering into that spirit, so it is only fair to recognize the credit due to the patriotic cooperation of the people of Porto Rico. In politics and government, in sanitation, public works, social and moral improvement, Porto Rico presents to-day the most impressive evidence of rapid and constructive achievements.

GOVERNMENT COST GROWS

"It has been said by hostile critics that the revenues and the budget of the island have increased to \$12,000,000. This is true, but it must be remembered that a proportionate increase has occurred with respect to schools, roads, public health, agriculture, labor, and, generally speaking, all branches of endeavor. Heavy expenditures have been necessary to defray the expenses of the government, and while there may possibly have been some extravagance, this has been relatively small and only such as is customary under similar conditions in all the countries of the world. It is well to remember, however, that taxation in Porto Rico is less, not only per capita, but less on wealth than anywhere under the American flag.

"A few outstanding facts will show our amazing development during the past 25 years.

"In 1902 the assessed value of property in Porto Rico was \$96,000,000. This has increased until June 30, 1924, the assessed value of real and personal property in the island was \$312,000,000. The total exports of Porto Rico in 1902 were \$12,434,000. In 1924 they were \$87,087,000, having reached a maximum of over \$150,000,000 in 1920, when the products of the island were generally at maximum prices.

BUDGET \$11,700,000

"For the fiscal year 1902 the total expenditures of the Government were slightly in excess of \$3,000,000. The budget for the current fiscal year contemplates budget expenditures of \$11,700,000.

"When the United States seriously took up the task of administering the affairs of Porto Rico in 1902, following the Spanish-American War, it was confronted with three great problems in

so far as expenditures were concerned. These embraced public health, public education, and public works. It is interesting to note how these three departments have fared in the increasing budget of the island.

"For the fiscal year 1902 the sanitary expenditures of the central government were \$112,000; for the department of education, \$517,000; for the department of public works, \$357,000. In 1924 the corresponding expenditures were:

"Sanitation	\$1,060,700
"Public schools and University of Porto Rico	4,500,000
"Maintenance and repairs of roads, bridges, and public buildings	1,600,000

"These three items amount to one-half of the total expenditures of the central government of Porto Rico and constitute considerably more than one-half of the annual budget and do not include any of the ordinary legislative, executive, and judicial expenditures.

INCREASE HELD NATURAL

"The commissioner of education as far back as 1902 emphasized the need in his department alone of \$3,000,000 per annum, so it will be seen that the current increases in expenditures over previous years are not unnatural.

"The question is whether or not our taxes are burdensome. The population in round numbers is 1,300,000, and the per capita tax to support the central government is less than \$10. The per capita tax for all other purposes is less than \$4. There is no State or Territory in the United States where the per capita tax is anywhere near so low. It can, therefore, be seen conclusively that the people of Porto Rico are not overtaxed. As an illustration it may be pointed out that our income tax on amounts exceeding \$100,000 provides for a maximum surtax of 10 per cent. Under the Federal income tax law incomes in excess of \$100,000 pay a surtax of 37 per cent, and the maximum surtax is 40 per cent.

REALTY TAX LESS

"The tax on real property is likewise less in Porto Rico. The highest tax assessed for the present fiscal year is 2.09 per cent for the city of San Juan. The tax elsewhere throughout the island is materially less. We, therefore, have in Porto Rico not only a lower per capita tax than in the United States but a decidedly lower tax on wealth.

"It would seem clear, therefore, in view of the pressing demands of education, public health, public works, and welfare work in general that there can be no question of the propriety of expending at least as much money as is now spent in Porto Rico.

"The public debt of the island on June 30, 1924, was \$16,773,000. This has been increased by the sale since that date of \$600,000 irrigation bonds, making a total slightly less than \$17,375,000. The funds from these bonds were all used in public works. Approximately \$6,000,000 thereof was in irrigation bonds, and the principal and interest on these bonds are to be paid from the land irrigated thereby. This is being done without difficulty, and the irrigation works have to date been fully justified by experience.

"On June 30, 1924, there was cash in the hands of the treasurer of Porto Rico amounting to \$9,124,924.14. The budget is prepared for two years. Just as the value of exports from the island may vary, due to prices, as they have fluctuated in the recent past from \$150,000,000 in 1920 to \$72,000,000 in 1922, so the estimated taxes may vary in a lesser degree.

EXPORTS ESTIMATE HIGH

"In the allegations as to the difficulties of the treasury of Porto Rico great importance was attached to the fact that it was necessary for the treasurer to obtain a short-time bank loan of \$2,000,000 to meet authorized expenditures in the fiscal year 1924. This was due entirely to the fact that the actual collections of revenues were less by approximately this amount than the treasury had estimated. That such an occurrence is possible would appear from the great variation in the value of exports from Porto Rico, as already pointed out. The reflex of this variation on the revenues of Porto Rico is well illustrated by this fact.

"In 1920 our exports were estimated at \$150,000,000. The income tax collected in Porto Rico based on those returns was \$4,163,000. In the following year the exports fell to \$112,000,000, and the income tax collected in the corresponding year fell to \$2,444,000, a variation of \$1,700,000 in a year. This, however, was not altogether, or even the principal cause of the falling off of the revenues in the fiscal year 1924.

"There were uncollected property taxes on June 30, 1924, of \$750,000; \$350,000 of this is pending judicial decision. Of the income tax, \$1,996,151.15 was pending collection at the end of the fiscal year, partly on appeal before the board of review and partly in litigation. The total delinquent and unpaid taxes at the end of the fiscal year amounted to \$3,000,000, much of this being in litigation.

"Had the law of Porto Rico clearly required the payment of assessed taxes under protest, the necessity of the \$2,000,000 loan would not have arisen.

SINKING FUND \$1,200,000

"The sinking funds in the hands of the treasurer at the end of the year amounted to slightly over \$1,200,000.

"It has also been pointed out by some critics under the impression that it indicated an unsatisfactory economic condition that the balance of trade against the island for the fiscal year 1924 was slightly more than \$1,000,000, whereas for a number of years the balance of trade in favor of the island had been considerable, varying in recent years from approximately \$7,000,000 to \$54,000,000.

"Of course, this is of no significance, and normally the balance of trade must be in favor of Porto Rico. An effort is being made by the island government to carry out a plan of public works which has been under contemplation for many years. This required the sale of bonds abroad and the purchase with the proceeds of supplies to be imported into Porto Rico.

SUGAR MILLS PROSPER

"Similarly, the sugar mills and other industrial properties are prospering and are taking advantage of the present prices, which are materially lower than the war-time prices, to make the necessary extensions and repairs to their plants.

"As the result of this there was imported into Porto Rico in the fiscal year 1924 in excess of \$1,700,000 in lumber and wood manufactures and \$2,700,000 in iron and steel manufactures over the preceding fiscal year. The importation of machinery and vehicles was an increase of \$2,700,000 over the preceding fiscal year.

"The fact, therefore, that the balance of trade for a particular fiscal year was against the island was only because of confidence in its economic condition and in preparation for increased development and production.

"I might say in conclusion that with an administrator on the scene such as Governor Towner the maladministration of affairs would be almost impossible. Not only has he proven wise and energetic, but he has probably done more than any other governor to cement the cordial relations existing between the Porto Ricans and the mainland. But the supervisory control is not vested wholly in the governor. The Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department is in constant and direct daily communication with the island. Gen. Frank McIntyre, the chief of that bureau, is universally recognized as an authority on insular affairs and Territorial administration. He has been connected with that work without intermission ever since the American insular possessions were acquired, and he has carefully scrutinized every budget prepared in Porto Rico. And while he has occasionally raised a warning finger when there seemed to be a tendency toward liberality in the matter of appropriations, yet his unfailing insistence on economy has, in fact, caused great care to be shown in the matter of appropriations. As a result I believe the record of the Legislature of Porto Rico with respect to economy will stand comparison with any similar legislative body in America."

VALENCIA ONIONS IN ARIZONA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the growth of Valencia onions in the State of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, last October I visited the Cochise County fair at Douglas, Ariz., and there saw an excellent exhibit of Valencia onions. It has been demonstrated very recently that this variety of onions can be successfully grown in southeastern Arizona, and the prices received have been so satisfactory that many farmers are planning to plant them. Mr. L. H. Herring, secretary of the Douglas Chamber of Commerce and Mines, has furnished me with the following statements published in the Tombstone Epitaph, which will convey an idea of the great interest that is being taken in this new agricultural development:

ONIONS! ONIONS!

The chief topic of conversation in the San Simon district is onions—and why shouldn't it be? Until this wonderful crop was proven, San Simon was practically unheard of, outside of Cochise County. To-day its fame has spread to the far East, where, in Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and other big eastern cities, Valencia onions grown in San Simon, Cochise County, Ariz., are in demand at top prices.

Several years ago if one had said that San Simon farm lands would to-day be producing from 20 to 25 tons—50,000 pounds, mind you—to

the acre, one would have truly been branded as a dreamer. But such is an established fact in the San Simon Valley to-day and this harvest season farmers who have heretofore been eking a mere existence on their land, growing unmarketable crops, expect to harvest and ship to eastern markets in the neighborhood of 80 carloads of this wonderful product with direct returns of not less than \$125,000 in profits.

And this gigantic enterprise is to mean that not only San Simon, Bowie, and the San Pedro Valleys, but the Sulphur Springs Valley as well, where conditions have proven to be ideal, will soon be producing a big proportion of the onions consumed by the United States, for nowhere is the climate and growing conditions duplicated. At San Simon they claim that due to peculiar soil conditions their production will never be equaled, and to see the growing crops leads one to believe that it will not be possible ever to produce more to the acre than the farmers of that district now have growing.

HUGE PROFITS

One man expects to clean up not less than \$10,000 from 9 acres; another will realize from 6 acres nearly that amount, due to practically a 100 per cent yield; many others who have acreage ranging from a half acre to 3 and 4 acres set out to Valencia will receive for their efforts enough money to "burn the mortgage" and go into the business of growing onions on a truly independent basis.

Although the growing of Valencia and Sweet Spanish onions has been in progress in Cochise County for several years, having been introduced in the San Pedro Valley about four years ago by J. A. Gumm, known as "the father of the Valencia," real enthusiasm has not been worked up until within the present year, when it has been demonstrated what a positive and tremendous yield can be harvested.

Last year H. O. Carr, formerly of the San Pedro Valley, produced from 6 acres enough to net him in the neighborhood of \$6,000, to be conservative, even after Chicago commission men beat him out of some \$3,000 in computing weight. Carr was the first man in the San Simon country to plant and make a success of growing onions. Gumm had already demonstrated what could be done in the San Pedro Valley. He bought his seed from Mr. Gumm at \$20 per pound. This year he has 9 acres in onions, and although his crop was attacked by thrip, an onion pest, he will produce in the neighborhood of 20 tons to the acre, which will net him in the neighborhood of 5 cents per pound. Figure the profit yourself.

WHAT F. SCOBLE DID

Take Scoble's case. He told us that he landed in San Simon 6 years ago with a family, from Globe, almost broke, and filed on his land. What he has accomplished in these 6 years is truly remarkable, and lends considerable argument to the great necessity of a "back to the farm" movement. Mr. Scoble has his farm laid off well to different crops.

He has 6 acres planted to onions, spring planting, and he has a perfect stand. He expects to harvest a tremendous yield in October—over 50,000 pounds to the acre. After this year's harvest of onions, alfalfa, berries, and grapes, Scoble will easily be on "easy street."

EX-BOOK AGENT PROSPERS

Then there is L. W. Palmer, a former book agent, who has traveled all over the country, and who, however, was raised on a farm. He expects to make 22 to 25 tons of Valencias to the acre this year on his place, which he rented last fall. He has 6 acres planted, and irrigates from an artesian well which flows less than 100 gallons a minute.

Mr. Palmer transplanted his settings, and as a result will get a 100 per cent yield. At present he estimated he will get 22 tons to the acre. Palmer also expects to receive around 6 cents per pound for his crop, which he is beginning to harvest. He will complete his harvest in October. It doesn't take an adding machine to figure what this man will realize on a rented piece of ground in less than a year.

Cost of raising crop estimated

Preparing seed bed 1 acre.....	\$25
Seed for 1 acre.....	20
Transplanting slips, 5 men 2 days.....	20
Irrigating 1 acre to finish crop.....	50
Gathering crop.....	15
Curing out crop.....	15
Crates to ship including assembling crates.....	80
Total.....	225

One acre will bring at 5 cents per pound, \$2,000. Will onions pay?

That the college of agriculture of the University of Arizona is giving attention to a proper solution of the problems attending the growing of Valencia onions is shown by the following letter:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Tucson, Ariz., December 9, 1924.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYDEN: Your letter to Dean Thornber was referred to me, as to the growing of Valencia onions in Arizona. At present

we have no reliable information as to the industry on a commercial scale. There is considerable trouble with varieties and harvesting methods that will yet have to be worked out. The thrips insect is causing considerable damage and loss in the crop. The present methods of harvesting and storage are not as efficient as we would like and are causing considerable loss in storage. At the present time we are carrying on experiments at the station, both as to varieties and storage practice. As soon as this experiment gives us conclusive data we will publish a bulletin for the information of yours and other interested parties.

As to climatic and soil conditions over our State, I might say that they are exceedingly favorable in most sections to the commercial raising of Sweet Spanish or Valencia onions. Of course, the farmers themselves must be educated as to proper methods of culture, harvesting, storage, etc. The onion, being an intensive crop, requires specialized cultural methods, as well as proper irrigation and fertilizer practice. As soon as these are worked out I see no reason why this State should not become one of the best and largest onion-producing sections of the country. There is a great opportunity in a commercial field along this line, as immense quantities are annually imported from Spain. We know that we can grow as good onions, and it is up to us to work out methods of production that will allow us to compete with this foreign trade.

If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

M. F. WHARTON,
Assistant Horticulturist.

I have also received a letter from Mr. P. G. Spillsbury, president of the Arizona Industrial Congress, which in part is as follows:

Mr. George Buxton, our director from Douglas, has made some investigation for us and believes that there is a possibility of producing 1,000 cars a year of Valencia onions in Cochise County. We have made inquiries in the East and find that a production of this size could be handled through St. Louis and Chicago markets.

The first thing that should be done is to show wholesalers in the territory which can be economically reached what the product is and that the grading and uniformity of the onions is such as will appeal to them. A new product must always be introduced at a price slightly below the market.

The trouble with the Valencia onion is that it has no market in Arizona or in other border States. It is a large, white, mild-flavored, sweet onion, while the trade in the border States, to a large extent Mexican and Indian, demands a small, very strong onion for flavoring. These people do not use onions for large decorative salads, as in the East, where the largest quantity of this type of onion finds its use. As a consequence our local wholesalers can not handle the onions produced in Cochise County.

There is no doubt that the Valencia onion as grown in Cochise County can be made a success, but it will require proper introduction and business methods.

To determine what might be the effect of a more extensive cultivation of Valencia onions in the United States I have made inquiry since my arrival in Washington and am printing the information that I have obtained. The following letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture describes the nature of this variety of onions:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 3, 1925.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAYDEN: In accordance with your telephone request of December 23 to Mr. T. H. Kearney the following information on Valencia onions is supplied:

The possibility of commercial production of this type of onion in the semiarid portions of the Southwest has been under consideration for many years, but it is only within the past few seasons that much attention has been paid to its production. The typical Valencia, Spanish, or Denia onion, all of these names being applied to the same type, is a nearly spherical, light-colored onion of mild flavor. The American-grown product is in all respects equal to the imported onions grown in the Provinces of Denia and Alicante, Spain. The Bermuda onion is quite a different type, being flat, white, yellow, or red, depending upon the variety; and, while mild in flavor, it is a poor keeper. Well-cured Denias can be kept for a considerable period. In Spain the growers make a practice of storing their onions in bamboo structures with thatched roofs and raised floors somewhat similar to a corner. Harvesting there takes place about midsummer, and the onions are often kept until spring.

The Valencia onion is distinguished from the winter-storage types most extensively grown in this country by its mild flavor and larger size. It does not seem to be well adapted to humid-climate conditions, although well-grown specimens are frequently produced in the East. As far as production is concerned, it can be grown in a large way in the Southwest, enormous acre yields often being secured. Whether

it can be shipped to eastern markets and sold profitably in competition with Spanish-grown onions is a point not yet determined.

Very truly yours,

W. A. TAYLOR, *Chief of Bureau.*

The Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce has written the following letter, which deals with the question of importations of onions from foreign countries:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, December 4, 1924.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of November 26, requesting data on the production of onions in Spain and other foreign countries and figures showing the imports of onions into the United States for the last five years.

The inclosed statement on onion production in the principal onion-producing countries and the statistics showing the imports into the United States by months from 1919 to date, with the quantities supplied this country by the principal onion-exporting countries, will, I believe, give you the information you desire. You will note that Spain furnishes the bulk of our onion imports, and these consist of the Valencia onion. Egypt is a large onion-producing country, and is the second largest source of our onion imports. The onions shipped to the United States from England consist in the main of transshipments, and no doubt most of these come from Egypt.

Sincerely yours,

JULIUS KLEIN, *Director.*

FOREIGN ONIONS

The estimated onion production in the countries which furnish the bulk of the imports into the United States is as follows:

	Bushels
Italy.....	3,226,000
Egypt.....	10,000,000
Spain (Valencia).....	8,000,000
Canary Islands.....	422,000
Bermuda.....	80,000

SPAIN

Practically all the onions grown in Spain for export are grown in the Valencia district. In this district two types of onions are grown—the "babosa," a large, flat, white onion, soft and a poor keeper and hence can not be shipped any distance. This onion does not reach our market, but is purchased by Great Britain to supply onions between the shipments of Valentias from Spain and the onions from Egypt. The other onion produced in the Valencia district is the "grano," and this is the onion we find on the markets in the United States.

Onions are sown in both the fall and spring. The seed is grown locally, and the onions are raised from seedlings; onion sets are not used. The seed beds are prepared in the month of December. They are formed in rectangular plats, 3 by 4 yards, with ridges surrounding each plat for the purpose of retaining the irrigation water. The soil is finely pulverized, and a small quantity of fertilizer, composed of sulphate of ammonia, superphosphate of lime, and ashes or potash is mixed in thoroughly. A little well-rotted stable manure is also used. Into this seed bed the seed is sown broadcast in the month of December and as late as January for the "grano" variety.

The seed of the "babosa" is sown in August. Sufficient irrigation is applied to germinate the seed and to develop the little plants. By the latter part of April the young plants have reached a height of 8 to 10 inches and are ready to be transplanted. In the case of the "babosa" the transplanting takes place in December. In the latter part of July or the first week in August the "grano" onion is ready for harvesting. The "babosa" is ready in May. Several days before the onions are pulled up the tops are leveled down to admit the sun to the bulbs and check the flow of sap into the tops. The "babosa" must be shipped at once, while the "grano" will keep until March unless defective or affected with disease.

The shipping season for onions in Spain extends practically throughout the year, beginning in May, when the "babosa" onion is ready for shipment. The new "grano" crop is ready for shipment in July or August.

Spanish onions reach the United States in cases of 120 pounds each, half cases of about 60 pounds each, and crates of about 40 pounds each. The crate is the most-used packing.

EGYPT

The bulk of the Egyptian onion crop comes from upper Egypt and is shipped chiefly to Great Britain. The onion which is grown in Egypt is the "Red Spanish," distinguished by its comparative mildness and its size. It contains less of the acrid and pungent volatile oil common to the ordinary onion, and is richer in saccharine substances. Two forms of onions are distinguished by Egyptians, the "Saidi" and the "Beheri," both being red in color. The "Saidi" forms the bulk of the export crop and is also extensively used for making native pickles.

In preparing the soil for onions in Egypt, on ordinary cultivated land under the canal system of irrigation, two or three plowings are usually given, after which the land is harrowed and ridged, the ridges being from 60 to 65 centimeters apart and running east and west. Water is allowed to flow into the furrows between the ridges until it reaches to about one-third from the crest of the ridge. The seedlings are then pushed by the finger in the mud, just on line marked by the water on the sides of the ridges. Both sides are planted with seedlings at a distance apart of about 15 centimeters. On the river bank nothing is done to the soil. The seedlings are planted on the flat, either singly in rows, the rows being 35 centimeters apart, or in small groups, these groups being in rows 50 centimeters apart. The seedlings are planted in the mud and the crops are raised without irrigation, the necessary water being supplied by the alluvium.

The usual time of sowing the seed, both in upper and lower Egypt, is the month of September. It is sown in a manured bed and the seedlings are allowed to remain in the bed until required. The seed bed is carefully watered a few days before the seedlings are pulled for transplanting. Cultivation should commence early and is frequent to keep the soil well stirred and to prevent the growth of weeds. Farmyard manure is indispensable in the production of superior bulbs unless the soil naturally contains a large amount of humus. On the alluviums in upper Egypt the crop is manured by putting the manure under the roots of the plants during the process of transplanting. On ordinary canal irrigated land the manure is applied from 30 to 45 days after transplanting, the plants being by that time completely established and ready to make use of the fertilizer. As a rule no water is given previous to the application of the manure. No water is given for about 25 days before gathering the crop. On an average about eight waterings are required for the whole season.

The first crop of onions in upper Egypt generally appears in March, and this when exported usually realizes the highest price. In upper Egypt the onion is at its best during the month of April, and in lower Egypt late in April and in May.

The bulbs after they show signs of ripeness are taken off and exposed to the sun for two days; the tops are then cut off close to the bulbs, after which they are again spread in the sun for a day before being delivered for sale. The storing of the bulbs is always attended with more or less loss. If not thoroughly cured when stored many of the bulbs will sprout and others will decay.

The Egyptian onion season commences on the 1st of September and ends on August 31 of the ensuing year. The principal shipments to the United States are made in March, April, and May. Shipments are made in sacks of 110 pounds each.

BERMUDA

A very small portion of Bermuda is devoted to onion growing, and, due to the topography of the islands, the onions are grown in very small areas and are cultivated by hand. The shipping season is during April, May, and June, and some years extends through July and even into August.

CANARY ISLANDS

Onions are grown on the Canary Islands in a manner very similar to that employed in growing onions in Texas. Most of the onions shipped from the Canary Islands are packed in 50-pound crates. The heaviest shipping season is in May, June, and July.

Imports of onions into the United States (By months. In bushels of 57 pounds each)

Month	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	First 9 months 1924
January.....	1,308	335,569	20,733	38,978	103,022	58,717
February.....	9,930	244,153	63,732	20,307	148,706	62,991
March.....	26,006	369,262	41,405	181,520	62,330	91,143
April.....	7,043	143,371	7,243	241,505	161,540	64,073
May.....	44,439	88,452	13,016	155,497	181,728	49,559
June.....	98,398	104,942	9,036	28,840	341,547	120,703
July.....	16,790	95,009	32,181	213,254	172,765	175,288
August.....	85,968	35,224	125,029	58,147	157,937	98,710
September.....	199,609	59,743	261,965	56,171	64,156	281,702
October.....	94,490	177,742	306,447	237,484	286,671
November.....	60,414	119,396	652,883	79,373	185,889
December.....	141,082	46,295	442,413	139,222	91,815
Total.....	740,686	1,819,158	1,976,083	1,450,298	1,958,106	1,002,888

Leading countries from which onions are imported into the United States (bushels)

Country	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
Spain.....	568,540	1,414,910	1,596,190	752,635	1,145,457
Canada.....	26,328	8,712	55,168	17,522	36,046
Italy.....	7,492	19,894	67,318	10,420	19,090
Egypt.....	10,486	189,108	248,544	461,412
Bermuda.....	94,796	74,345	19,849	33,593	17,852
England.....	13,264	54,749	174,010	108,975	187,075
Canary Islands.....	8,949	27,571	12,939	11,631	12,906

The following extracts from Weather, Crops, and Markets, issued by the Department of Agriculture, refer to the importation of onions from abroad:

Our imports of onions fluctuated from 260,000 to 1,800,000 bushels during the past decade. Spain is the only source from which receipts have continued to grow. In 1900 we obtained from her one-half as many onions as from Great Britain and one-sixth as many as from Bermuda. During 1921 receipts from Spain were over ten times the sum of those via Great Britain and Bermuda, or 1,100,000 bushels. Half our imports were offset, however, by exports, principally to Canada, Mexico, and the West Indies. (September 1, 1923.)

SPANISH ONIONS MEET A STRONG DEMAND IN NEW YORK—MORE REQUESTS THAN USUAL FOR SMALL-SIZED STOCK—PRICES FAIRLY STEADY SO FAR THIS SEASON

The Spanish onion market at New York City has exhibited much strength this fall. Prospects for a comparatively short crop in the among the principal reasons for the strong tone the market is showing. United States and the increased demand in England and Holland are Drought in both England and Holland reduced the crops in those countries.

Usually only a small quantity of five-tier stock is imported from Spain. This year, however, there have been numerous requests for this comparatively small-sized stock, thus indicating that the domestic supply of medium-sized onions, which are about the same size as small Spanish stock, is not sufficient to meet all demands.

The quality of the Spanish stock this season has been unusually good. With clear, dry weather it has matured well, with little indication of disease.

FEWER AUCTION SALES

Formerly it was the custom to sell most of the Valencia onions by auction. At present the quantity sold under the hammer is probably not in excess of 20 per cent of the total arrivals. It has been found through experience that returns are quicker and more satisfactory generally when the stock is sold to large wholesalers directly on arrival than when it is sold through the auction companies.

The principal sources of supply of Spanish onions are the Gandia, Denia, and Valencia sections of Spain. The Denia section usually ships earliest, followed by the Gandia section. These two sections have exhausted their supplies by this time of year, and Valencia is the only place from which future supplies will be available. Shipments were unusually early this year, the first arrivals in New York being on July 14, whereas the first receipts in 1920 were on August 7. Indications at present are that arrivals during October will exceed those of September.

Prices of Spanish onions have not fluctuated greatly during the season so far. The first arrivals sold at comparatively high prices, due to the usual desire on the part of dealers to obtain a share of the first arrivals of practically all commodities in which they deal. The crates of this first shipment sold on auction at \$2.40 to \$2.95, and the cases ranged \$5.75 to \$6.50. Cases hold 125 to 130 pounds of onions and crates hold 37 to 40 pounds. During August prices of crates ranged \$1.05 to \$1.90, most of the sales being made at \$1.20 to \$1.50. Cases realized between \$3.25 to \$3.60, and half cases, few of which were offered, sold at a range of \$1.75 to \$2.05. During most of September prices remained steady at about the same ranges, but toward the end of the month, when supplies of all kinds of good stock became lighter, prices advanced considerably until best cases realized as high as \$4.62½.

The freight rate on Spanish onions varies a trifle, according to the steamship company which carries them. According to the present rate of exchange, however, the rates are approximately 17 to 20 cents a crate, 50 to 60 cents a case, and 25 to 30 cents a half case.

Undoubtedly the outlook is for an active market on Spanish onions for the rest of the season. Although it has been usual for only certain elements of the trade in this country to take kindly to this class of onions, the estimated general shortage of choice native stock undoubtedly will tend to increase the demand for the Spanish product. (October 22, 1921.)

Receipts of Spanish onions at New York to September 15 were reported unofficially at 384,025 packages, or more than double the average of the three preceding seasons to the same date. (September 23, 1922.)

EXPORTS OF ONIONS FROM THE VALENCIA DISTRICT, SPAIN, HAVE BEEN LIGHT

With one of the largest onion crops on record in the Valencia district of Spain, exports from that district during the present season up to the end of November were only about one-fourth of the total crop, according to a recent report received from the American vice consul at Valencia. In 1921 practically the entire crop had been exported by the end of November of that year. These decreased exports are

accompanied by a decline in prices. Exports of onions to the United States up to October 8, 1922, are reported as 80,012 cases, compared with 262,883 cases for the same period of last year.

Great Britain offers the principal market for Valencia onions, the United States holds second place, and small shipments are made to Ireland, Canada, Germany, Sweden, Norway, France, Holland, and Belgium. A copy of the report received from the American vice consul at Valencia, Spain, may be obtained upon request to the Foreign Section, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C., for Report No. 76517. (January 20, 1923.)

FOREIGN ONIONS IN NEW YORK MARKET

Most of the onion shipments from Spain and Egypt to this country come through the port of New York. In past years there has been a little direct buying by firms in some of the larger inland cities, but the practice has been discontinued, largely, it is said, because the buying of foreign onions is a specialized business which can be carried on more successfully by firms who can handle a large volume and give their entire attention to it, than by firms who must handle a number of other products as well.

Spanish onions come in three types of packages—the case, holding about 120 pounds of onions; the half case, holding about 60 pounds, and the crate, holding about 40 pounds. The crate is the principal package used, and all of the largest stock is packed in this container, the size of the onions being designated by the count, "72's," "50's," "32's." Egyptian onions come in 100-pound sacks.

Few shipments of foreign onions are sent to this country on consignment. The chief obstacle is the freight (50 to 60 cents per 100 pounds), which must be prepaid, and the tariff (1 cent per pound), which is collectible upon arrival regardless of what the onions bring. If forced to consign because of lack of demand, Spanish shippers prefer to risk their shipments in the nearer and more dependent English markets. Except for the comparatively perishable early crop, Spanish onions have excellent keeping quality and can be stored for several months, so the marketing can be spread over the greater part of the year. American dealers say that, regardless of what they might desire in the matter, practically all the foreign onions imported here are paid for "C. I. F." (that is, by a sum including cost, insurance, and freight), before they leave their originating port. Importers purchase either direct from shippers (Spanish firms, in the case of Spanish onions, and English, Syrian, or Greek firms, in the case of Egyptian stock), or through New York brokers who represent the shippers. Occasionally it happens that a shipment or part of a shipment is consigned to a broker, but these instances are rare, and even in such cases a sale usually is effected before the shipment arrives.

In some seasons a considerable part of the imports of Spanish onions are sold at auction in New York, this volume sometimes amounting to 25 per cent of the amount sold locally, but usually not being more than 10 per cent. Since the onions offered at auction are the property of New York firms and since they do not consider the auction a desirable medium for selling onions, this method of sale is used rather as an emergency measure than as a regular practice. Some importers have their own trade connections in inland cities, and others sell through brokers. Most sales to out-of-town customers are made before the onions arrive in port. They are then loaded from the ship directly into freight cars and billed to the buyer.

A side line to their regular business has been developed by some of the auction companies in connection with this out-of-town selling. Importers selling to inland city trade through brokers frequently request an auction company to bill the shipments and collect the money on the sales. The auction company accepts the invoice and pays the bill at once, discounting the amount 3 per cent for the risk and service of collection. This practice developed through auction companies selling part of some shipments and being asked to collect for small lots privately. Some of them maintain extensive rating information and credit facilities. (September 15, 1923.)

The heavy movement from Holland is the feature of the year's onion import trade. Arrivals during July and August were about 300,000 bushels, compared with only a few hundred bushels from Holland for the whole of last year. So far this season Egypt ranks first, Holland second, and Spain third among sources of onion imports. Total foreign onion arrivals for eight months have been nearly as large as for the whole of last year. (October 6, 1923.)

ONION NOTES

SPAIN

The 16,000 acres planted to onions in Valencia supply most of onions exported from Spain, says Consul Robert Harnden at Valencia. The season runs from May to May, with heaviest harvest in September.

The heaviest exports occur in August and September, the stocks reaching this country just after our own onions are harvested and ready to sell.

During the season 1921-22 the estimated production in Valencia was 6,100,000 bushels and for 1922-23 was 8,000,000 bushels. Short crops in America stimulated Spanish production. However, our tariff discouraged shipments to America and then with continued heavy production in Spain depressed prices, with the result that the Spanish onion industry suffered some loss during the last season. Spanish sources report that as long as the American crop is plentiful the Spanish growers at present are finding it hard to compete on the American market, even in the out-of-season trade. There is always a large exportable surplus in Spain.

EGYPT

According to a report from Vice Consul Winfield H. Scott, at Alexandria, for the last four years the quantity and value of declared onion exports from Alexandria were:

Year	Bushels	Value
1920.....	205,160	\$335,386
1922.....	313,271	849,843
1923 (first 9 months).....	482,943	383,685

The highest value for any pre-war year was \$319,109. The quantity shipped out in 1923 was greater than that of previous years, owing, it is said, to the smaller quantity taken from Spain. Egyptian onions can compete successfully on our markets, as evidenced by heavier imports, especially during the past year. The areas to be seeded to onions in Egypt during 1924 are expected to be greater than 1923, owing to the success of the past season. An extensive increase in production might lower prices in America for imported onions. One unusual feature of 1923 was the length of the shipping season. Instead of the usual period of March to May or June, the Egyptian crop kept on coming to America up to the end of August. (April 30, 1924.)

1924 ONION CROP IN EGYPT AND SPAIN

An official report estimates the 1924 onion crop of Egypt to be 9,621,473 bushels, a decrease of 385,850 bushels from last year, when the total crop amounted to 10,007,323 bushels. According to the declared exports at the Alexandria consulate the United States received only 279,392 bushels of Egyptian onions during the period from September 1, 1923, to August 31, 1924, as compared with 470,353 bushels for the same period the previous season. The exports during both seasons showed a marked increase in comparison with shipments of previous years.

The total onion crop of the Valencia district of Spain is estimated to be 5,702,000 bushels, according to a cable just received from Consul Edwards. This is a considerable increase over an earlier estimate of 3,158,000 bushels sent by the same consul. According to a commercial estimate, the total crop for this Province last year amounted to 3,509,000 bushels. The Valencia onion crop represents practically the entire commercial crop of Spain. Ninety-four per cent of the total exports from Spain during 1920 were from that Province. (October 4, 1924.)

In order to secure information relative to the production of onions within the United States which might compete with the Arizona crop, I made inquiry of the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture and have received the following letter from him:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, December 13, 1924.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAYDEN: You called me on the telephone a few days ago, requesting information with regard to the growing of Valencia onions in the State of Arizona.

I have had our people look into the situation and am sending herewith a statement which has been prepared entitled "Production of Valencia onions in Southwestern United States." This statement deals both with the growing of onions in your section of the country and with Spanish onions, and a discussion on the importation of onions from foreign countries, and marketing conditions in the United States.

Reference is made in the statement to certain printed and mimeographed material which appears on the onion situation. This material is being sent you with this letter, as well as other statements dealing with the onion crop, and various references to market conditions, receipts, importations, etc.

If there is any further specific information which you desire on this question, I shall be glad to go into the subject further upon request.

Very truly yours,

H. C. TAYLOR, Chief of Bureau.

PRODUCTION OF VALENCIA ONIONS IN SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES

Considerable interest in the production of Spanish Valencia onions has been shown recently by western States, particularly Utah and New Mexico. Probably three-fourths of the Utah onions are Spanish type, and farmers have met with much success in the growing of this crop. Prof. Fabian Garcia, director of the New Mexico Agricultural Experiment Station, advises that much enthusiasm has developed regarding Valencia onions in his State and that numerous experimental plantings are proposed. In view of the fact that any such onions grown and marketed in the United States may have to compete with stock from Spain, consideration should be given to the whole subject of imports.

Imported onions are of some market importance in competition with the early crop in the spring and summer and with the main crop in seasons of light domestic production. As they are somewhat different from domestic stock in appearance and quality, they are not acceptable to all classes of trade, and in some city markets, especially those of the West, are regarded as not greatly affecting the course of prices for domestic stock.

Imports from Spain and Egypt, some of them direct and some through English ports, are of chief importance, as they comprise the great bulk of receipts. Liberal imports from Holland were the unusual feature of the 1923 season. Bermuda, formerly the main source of early imports, now ships only a few thousand bushels and ranks with Italy, Chile, Mexico, and other lesser sources of supply.

About four-fifths of the average total onion imports to the United States are from Spain, and the United States ranks next to Great Britain as a market for Spanish onions. The imported Spanish onions come mostly from two Mediterranean points, Valencia and Denia. Although commonly spoken of as the Valencia, most of the oval, yellow Spanish onions coming into this country might be referred to properly as Denia. However, the differences would seem to be largely those of strain and from soil and other factors.

Just about half of the average imports of onions come during the last four months of the year, but in some seasons of domestic shortage the imports began early and continued heavy throughout winter and spring.

New York receives and distributes about 86 per cent of the average imports. Boston handles half the others. Of six remaining import districts, none exceed 2 per cent of the average receipts. Boston and San Francisco tended to increase in importance. For 1922 San Francisco stood next to New York and Boston, gaining apparently at the expense of several eastern ports.

SPANISH ONIONS

The main onion season in Spain is not very different from that of the main crop in the United States. Harvesting of the main crop variety, an oval-shaped kind, golden yellow in color, begins in July, and shipments, partly from storage, continue about eight months. This variety is a good keeper. The large, flat, white spring variety from the Valencia district is marketed in spring and early summer, but is too poor in keeping quality for distant marketing and comprises only about 5 per cent of the imports from Spain.

The imports compete chiefly as long-keeping stock and are equivalent to about one-tenth of the total onions shipped to market, having averaged about 3,000 carloads per year since 1919. They come whenever conditions favor. A light main crop here is likely to be followed by heavy fall or winter imports, as in 1919-20 and 1921-22, and Spanish onions are available nearly throughout the year whenever the price is high enough to overcome the handicaps of freight at 20 cents per crate and tapif of 1 cent per pound.

It is understood that the freight charges on cargoes from Spain or other foreign countries vary according to the season and according to space available on each ship as it sails, so that the freight rate of 20 cents is only approximate.

Total imports from Spain and other leading countries are shown on pages 378 to 380 of Foreign Corps and Markets for April 30, 1924. The same paper contains crop notes from Spain and farm prices.

New York is the chief distribution center for Spanish onions. Methods of sale do not differ from those for other onions except that about 20 per cent are sold at auction. Most of the imports not reshipped to receivers and jobbers in other cities are sold by the importing receivers to local jobbers and resold by them to the retailers.

The usual package is the crate, holding 37 to 40 pounds. Cases containing 125 to 130 pounds also are used, and a few half cases holding about 64 pounds. Measurements taken of a limited number of these containers indicate that the average inside dimensions of crates are 6¼ by 17½ by 17¼ inches and of cases 10½ by 14½ by

38 inches. The gross weight of the measured cases was 144 pounds and the tare 18 pounds. Gross weight of crates was 45 pounds and the tare about 8 pounds.

Grading of Spanish onions does not appear to be so strict as that of most domestic stock, but the favorite size seems to be 3 to 3½ inches in diameter. Crates of the larger size usually contain 50 onions and smaller size 72 onions.

Large interior cities probably would be the best markets for Spanish onions grown in Arizona. Most of the onions imported from Spain arrive in New York City, with smaller quantities unloaded in such ports as Boston and San Francisco. Redistribution is made from these port cities to the inland markets. The attached tabulation of onion unloads in 31 principal cities shows the relative position of imported onions. It should be kept in mind, of course, that the imports indicated for inland markets are reshipped stock (and therefore duplications) from the port cities.

In case correspondence should be found desirable with the leading onion dealers in the middle western markets who handle Spanish onions, this bureau can furnish a limited list of such firms on request.

THE SOUTH TEXAS BERMUDA ONION DEAL, SEASON 1923

I also include the following extracts from a summary of the South Texas Bermuda onion deal for the season of 1923 which was prepared by V. D. Callanan, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in the belief that it might prove of some help to the growers and shippers in connection with the marketing of the 1924 crop:

CONDITIONS AT THE OPENING OF THE 1923 SEASON

Estimates of the acreage planted to early Bermuda and Creole onions in the States of Texas, Louisiana, and California showed that Texas had a slight increase, Louisiana had approximately the same area, and that California had planted only approximately one-half of the area devoted to the crop the previous season. The following table shows the acreage figures for these States over a period of years, as estimated by the Crops Estimates Division of this bureau:

Acreage of Bermuda and Creole onions harvested, 1917-1923

State	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
California.....	1,325	1,412	865	3,300	2,000	2,950	1,340
Louisiana.....	3,065	1,565	972	1,080	1,020	1,100	1,100
Texas.....	12,050	18,070	6,590	12,446	10,500	11,920	12,590
Total.....	16,440	21,047	8,247	16,826	13,520	15,970	15,030

In their desire to realize profits similar to those obtained on early shipments in 1922, most growers in the Laredo district planted their 1923 acreage from two weeks to a month earlier than the previous season. Transplanting from the seed beds began about October 25, and probably two-thirds of the crop had been set out by December 1, whereas Christmas ordinarily marks the completion of this work. With such an early start and generally favorable growing weather in December and January the plants made good progress and gave promise of maturing at an almost equally early date.

February weather, however, proved unusually cold. Growth was checked almost completely and the freezing temperatures of March 16-18 caught the crop so far advanced that complete recovery could not be hoped for. When more favorable growing conditions were restored, the plants attempted to preserve themselves and the usual results were soon in evidence—bottle necks, seed stems, splits, and doubles. Several days of clear skies and high temperatures were experienced the first week of April, and when the tops in many of the first-planted fields began to turn yellow growers began digging in the belief that further improvement was impossible.

OLD STOCK SUPPLIES MARKET EARLY IN TEXAS SEASON

Delay in the movement of Texas onions permitted old stock to retain first place on the markets and northern and midwestern globes, supplemented by arrivals of Egyptian stock, continued to fill existing demands. During March, Texas shipped only 22 cars, as against a total of 88 cars moved during the same month in 1922.

The extent to which the carry-over of old-crop onions influenced market conditions may be realized from the following facts taken from an onion-crop review published in Weather, Crops, and Markets, April 21:

"The seasonal output from 14 late or main-crop States filled about 20,200 cars, thereby breaking all records. This total is 6,800 cars more than were marketed last season and 1,300 cars above the 1920-21 season, which was the highest previous record. The 1921 crop was so short that only a dozen cars of old onions were shipped during the first half of April, 1922, whereas 275 cars were forwarded during the corresponding weeks in 1921 and 212 cars between April 1 and 14 this year.

"Indiana and Ohio led the list this season with 4,575 cars and 4,450 cars, respectively. For Indiana this is an increase of 150 per cent over last season and 33 per cent more than in 1920-21. For Ohio a gain of 156 per cent over the 1921-22 season is shown, and nearly 40 per cent more than two years ago. New York has shipped fewer onions than during either of the last two seasons, the total to April 14 being about 2,675 cars. Massachusetts, with 1,820 cars, shows a decrease of 18 per cent from last year and 53 per cent less than in 1920-21. Michigan marketed four times as many onions as last season and two and one-half times as many as the preceding year, the total from that State being 1,750 cars. Colorado's shipments increased sharply to 700 cars, but northern California's output was only 2,300 cars, or much less than the last two seasons."

POOR QUALITY AFFECTS PRICES

Because of the impracticability of sorting field-run stock of such poor quality as was being harvested sufficiently close to meet the requirements of the State "commercial pack" grade (which stipulates that at least 50 per cent shall be No. 1 onions), all shipments from the Laredo district during the entire season were sold either upon a description basis or "f. o. b., cash track." Sales during the first 10 days ranged generally \$2.50-\$2.75 per crate, cash track, mostly \$2.50 per crate, with wire order quotations 10 cents to 25 cents per crate higher. Up to April 16 no sales of straight cars of Crystal White Wax has been reported sold, but nominal market quotations placed this stock 25 cents higher than Yellow Bermudas.

As shipments increased during the last half of April prices declined steadily and by the first week in May the market on Yellow Bermudas had reached a level of around \$1.50-\$1.60 per crate, cash track. In spite of shippers' estimates of a 2,500-2,800-car crop in Texas, buyers in the terminal markets manifested comparatively little interest in the deal during the first half of the shipping season, largely because of the knowledge that the stock being shipped was of rather poor quality. The demand for old onions of good quality and condition continued and importations of Egyptian stock met a ready market.

In spite of the disastrous outlook for the crop after the freezing weather of March and the serious competition from the unprecedented supplies of late-crop onions, most growers saw the season close with the feeling that market prices had been very satisfactory, considering quality and pack, and while comparatively few made any profit from the crop, losses were not so heavy as had been feared at the start of the season.

Primary destinations of south Texas onions, 1923 season

Alabama:	
Birmingham.....	8
Mobile.....	1
Total.....	9
Arkansas:	
Little Rock.....	1
Colorado:	
Denver.....	4
Pueblo.....	1
Trinidad.....	3
Total.....	8
Connecticut:	
New Haven.....	1
Stamford.....	1
Waterbury.....	3
Total.....	5
Florida:	
Tampa.....	4
Georgia:	
Augusta.....	1
Atlanta.....	3
Columbus.....	1
Total.....	5
Illinois:	
Chicago.....	115
Indiana:	
Evansville.....	3
Indianapolis.....	8
Total.....	11
Iowa:	
Des Moines.....	1
Dubuque.....	1
Total.....	2
Kansas:	
Parsons.....	4
Wichita.....	2
Total.....	6

Kentucky:	
Louisville	12
Louisiana:	
New Orleans ¹	84
Shreveport	2
Total	36
Maine:	
Portland	4
Maryland:	
Baltimore	4
Massachusetts:	
Boston ¹	64
North Adams	2
Springfield	3
Total	69
Michigan:	
Detroit	39
Minnesota:	
Mankato	2
Minneapolis	3
Total	5
Mississippi:	
Vicksburg	1
Missouri:	
Joplin	2
Kansas City ¹	108
St. Louis ¹	1,066
Total	1,176
New York:	
Buffalo	21
Brooklyn	1
Clinton	1
Elmira	1
New York ¹	338
Rochester	6
Schenectady	6
Syracuse	6
Utica	2
Williamson	1
Total	379
North Carolina:	
Asheville	1
Raleigh	1
Total	2
Ohio:	
Akron	2
Cincinnati	22
Cleveland	36
Columbus	8
Toledo	4
Youngstown	1
Total	73
Oklahoma:	
Enid	1
Oklahoma City	5
Tulsa	1
Total	7
Pennsylvania:	
Philadelphia ¹	116
Pittsburgh ¹	115
Scranton	2
Wilkes-Barre	1
Total	234
Rhode Island:	
Providence	2
Tennessee:	
Bristol	1
Chattanooga	1
Memphis ¹	24
Total	26
Texas:	
Amarillo	1
Austin	1
Beaumont	3
Big Springs	1
Cuero	3
Dallas	10
El Paso	2
Fort Worth	16
Galveston ¹	10
Houston ¹	30
Longview	1
Lubbock	1
Nacogdoches	1

¹ Diversion point.

Texas—Continued	
San Antonio	11
Taylor ¹	22
Texarkana	2
Waco	14
Yoakum	1
Total	130
Virginia:	
Norfolk	1
West Virginia:	
Bluefield	2
Charleston	2
Clarksburg	3
Hinton	1
Huntington	1
Lynchburg	1
Total	10
Ontario, Canada:	
London	1
Toronto	5
Total	6
Quebec, Canada:	
Montreal	2
Unknown	107
Total	2,492

Crops and Markets for April 19, 1924, published by the Department of Agriculture contains the following articles relative to the domestic production of onions:

TEXAS ONIONS MOVING

The Texas onion crop is very late this season. Wet weather and the disastrous results of too early planting last year tended to delay planting. Intended acreage of 13,350 was reduced to 10,210 because of unfavorable weather at the usual time of transplanting and loss of plants from excessive rain. A large number died after setting out, reducing the stand below the average, according to the local representative of the Federal Market News Service at Laredo. However, after the crop in that section was set out, favorable weather conditions caused much improvement, and early in April there was every evidence of its maturing at quality above the average.

Stand in the upper counties is reported poor and movement probably will be 300 cars less than March estimates. In the Laredo district 300 more cars are expected, or total Bermuda onion shipments around 3,500 cars, of 530 bushels each. From a crop of 1,663,400 bushels last year 2,879 cars were shipped, and from 2,341,700 bushels in 1922 about 4,415 cars moved, while the five-year average production has been 2,225,200 bushels and average shipments 4,198 cars. Texas production this season is forecast at 2,039,600 bushels. That State produces three-fourths of the entire commercial crop of Bermuda onions grown in the United States.

The first car forwarded this season was from the Gulf coast section on April 4, and by April 8 this was the only car reported. In past years movement to that date was as follows: 1923, 36 cars; 1922, 415 cars; 1921, 635 cars; 1920, 29 cars; 1919, 8 cars; 1918, 98 cars; 1917, 199 cars; and 1916, 1,279 cars. Very few shipments were expected until April 14, with light movement for several days thereafter.

Early f. o. b. sales at Laredo were around \$2.50 per crate, and jobbing price in Kansas City was \$3.75. Some Yellow Bermudas from Mexico had anticipated first shipments from Texas and sold around \$3-\$4 per bushel basket. Sales during the first 10 days of the deal last year ranged \$2.50-\$2.75 f. o. b. cash track. The 1923 season in city markets opened about March 25 at \$3.50-\$3.75 a crate. A month later poor stock had depressed some markets until the price went as low as \$1.75. Quality was generally inferior during the first part of the season because of freezing weather in March, but when it was realized that production would be considerably curtailed, stocks remaining in May sold at fairly good prices. Standardization of pack and quality will be brought about this season by the Federal-State inspection service at shipping points, which will be operated for the first time on Texas onions.

ONIONS IN NORTH TEXAS

About 250 carloads of onions are expected from Collin County, Tex., just north of Dallas, according to estimates of the local trade and the McKinney Chamber of Commerce. Output last year was 160 cars. Plantings this season were increased about one-eighth to a total of 4,500 acres. It is too early as yet to estimate the yield per acre, but last season's average yield was 50 bushels, or about 20 per cent below normal as a result of the hot and dry weather in that section. High winds and freezing temperatures during March this year damaged young plants possibly 25 per cent, although by April 1 the stand

¹ Diversion point.

was considered satisfactory. With continued favorable weather the Collin County crop should begin to move about the 1st of July.

Onions in this part of Texas are planted in February and March in 3-foot rows, cotton being planted later between the rows. This season the different varieties are estimated: 70 per cent Prizetaker, 20 per cent White Globe, 5 per cent Crystal Wax, and the remaining 5 per cent Denia. Principal shipping points are Melissa, Princeton, Farmersville, and McKinney. A large portion of the crop grown in this section is trucked to Fort Worth and Dallas and to other nearby towns and cities.

ONION CROP OF THE UNITED STATES

Onions ranked eighth among vegetables in acreage in 1919, according to the census, but in total value were exceeded only by potatoes, tomatoes, and cabbage.

The following tables relating to the production of onions in the United States are taken from a "Summary of the Western and Central New York Onion Deal, Season 1923-24," by C. L. Brown, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture:

Onion acreage in leading States

State	Acreage				
	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
BERMUDA AND CREOLE					
California.....	860	3,300	2,000	2,950	1,340
Louisiana.....	970	1,080	1,010	1,100	1,100
Texas.....	6,590	12,450	10,500	11,920	12,680
Total.....	8,420	16,830	13,510	15,970	15,120
DOMESTIC					
California.....	6,890	8,480	7,900	6,720	7,010
Colorado.....	830	760	1,300	1,900	2,360
Idaho.....	60	280	140	300	300
Illinois.....	910	1,000	1,040	1,250	1,080
Indiana.....	4,390	5,260	4,180	5,620	5,900
Iowa.....	1,190	1,580	1,240	1,610	1,540
Kentucky.....	1,000	900	1,000	1,000	1,000
Massachusetts.....	4,400	4,850	4,500	4,560	3,360
Michigan.....	1,620	1,440	1,350	1,750	1,840
Minnesota.....	1,520	1,540	1,430	1,470	1,050
New Jersey.....	2,380	2,610	2,380	2,360	2,290
New York.....	8,560	8,570	7,280	7,740	7,390
Ohio.....	5,590	5,960	5,080	5,680	5,700
Oregon.....	760	880	870	880	600
Pennsylvania.....	330	350	340	350	250
Utah.....	120	120	120	250	400
Virginia.....	870	950	1,120	1,320	1,290
Washington.....	1,190	1,400	1,230	1,530	1,500
Wisconsin.....	1,490	1,180	1,010	1,030	1,090
Total.....	44,100	48,110	43,560	47,320	45,980
Grand total.....	52,520	64,940	57,070	63,290	61,100

Yield per acre in leading States

State	Yield per acre				
	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
BERMUDA AND CREOLE					
California.....	312	298	245	320	297
Louisiana.....	160	158	206	300	106
Texas.....	267	256	207	197	129
Total.....	259	258	213	227	142
DOMESTIC					
California.....	375	325	225	250	300
Colorado.....	250	340	300	280	250
Idaho.....	400	485	470	460	425
Illinois.....	200	350	210	300	289
Indiana.....	200	398	265	413	276
Iowa.....	300	350	205	380	365
Kentucky.....	300	370	300	225	298
Massachusetts.....	340	450	280	275	345
Michigan.....	175	350	225	511	267
Minnesota.....	275	300	200	350	220
New Jersey.....	250	240	250	250	194
New York.....	265	340	300	270	418
Ohio.....	250	340	225	400	253
Oregon.....	300	370	300	300	295
Pennsylvania.....	300	350	270	380	200
Utah.....	500	480	440	400	375
Virginia.....	250	320	280	225	254
Washington.....	400	410	300	320	450
Wisconsin.....	196	360	300	350	279
Total.....	280	353	259	320	308
Grand total.....	277	329	248	296	267

Onions; car-lot shipments by States of origin

State	1919-20	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24
Massachusetts.....	2,835	3,834	2,224	1,912	2,453
New York.....	2,702	3,089	2,891	2,812	5,315
New Jersey.....	634	635	427	479	336
Virginia.....	133	181	140	371	274
Ohio.....	1,913	3,212	1,743	4,492	2,710
Indiana.....	1,005	3,448	1,834	4,683	4,585
Illinois.....	123	360	253	487	374
Michigan.....	224	795	417	1,867	1,172
Wisconsin.....	95	406	89	330	266
Minnesota.....	439	276	172	500	186
Iowa.....	488	870	411	918	882
Kentucky.....	339	303	361	257	262
Louisiana.....	101	106	79	91	81
Texas.....	2,876	5,086	4,208	4,629	3,027
Colorado.....	207	134	443	651	920
Washington.....	596	790	649	765	1,110
Oregon.....	202	19	347	263	382
California N. D.....	4,887	3,169	2,657	2,376	3,473
California S. D.....	522	1,233	928	1,266	755
All others.....	228	277	434	609	679
Total.....	20,549	28,223	20,707	29,758	29,242

The following is taken from the Weekly Market Review, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture on December 9, 1924:

ONION MARKET IMPROVES

After remaining at low levels the last two months, wholesale prices of onions have advanced rather sharply, especially in the East. Colder weather helped to stimulate the market. Best New York yellows had been averaging around \$1.75 per sack in New York City, but advanced since Thanksgiving to a range of \$2.50 to \$2.75. The f. o. b. price at shipping points jumped 75 cents, and at last reports shippers were refusing \$2.50 a sack. In southwest Michigan buyers were offering from \$2.15 to \$2.25, compared with \$1.40 in mid-November. Middle western yellows strengthened in Chicago to \$1.30 to \$2.25. Prices to jobbers had been running about \$1 per sack less than in the autumn of 1923, but with the recent upward movement this difference is decreasing, and in New York City has narrowed to 25 cents. Last season was just the opposite of this year, for then terminal market prices continuously declined until low point in the spring of 1924. Returns to growers have been exceptionally poor this season, for the difference in f. o. b. prices compared with a year ago has been even greater than \$1. But, under the improved conditions, values are now almost up to last December's level.

Although total car-lot shipments showed a gradual seasonal decrease since late October, movement during recent weeks has been about 25 per cent heavier than for the corresponding period last season. The first week of December 500 cars of onions were forwarded, chiefly from western New York and Ohio. The uncertainty of the market is reflected in cold-storage holdings scarcely more than half those of November 1, 1923. October imports, mostly from Spain, decreased to 370 carloads of 500 bushels each, as against 640 carloads in September. During October of last season more than 650 cars were imported, attracted partly by the higher prices. Late quotations on Spanish Valencias were \$1.50 to \$1.65 a crate in eastern cities and \$2 in the Middle West.

The conclusions that I have reached after a study of this material are as follows:

First. That at present there is a market in the United States for Valencia onions, which can be supplied by American growers at a fair price, but that prices can be greatly reduced by overproduction. The best market for Arizona-grown Valencia onions is in the Mississippi Valley or the Middle West where the competition with onions grown in Spain and other foreign countries is reduced by the railroad haul from the Atlantic seaports.

Second. If Valencia onions of superior quality can be grown in Arizona at a season of the year when other onions of like variety are not upon the market in great quantities this new crop will continue to be profitable. The only way to maintain satisfactory prices is to carefully study the conditions under which these onions can be produced and marketed. This information should be supplied by the State and Federal agricultural agencies.

Third. It is certain that the production of Valencia onions on a large scale will require the utilization of well-organized cooperative associations among the growers, not only to promote orderly marketing, but to maintain the grades and to supervise the methods of packing and shipment.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11308, a bill making

appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may extend for one hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and three-quarters of an hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate on the deficiency bill be limited to one hour and a half, half of that time to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINBLOM in the chair.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, with the understanding that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as the law contemplates, so that the people of the country may know what is in it, I will not object.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What advantage is there in having one of these long bills printed in the RECORD in fine type? I do not think anyone ever reads them. I shall not object, but what advantage is there?

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of saving every dollar of public money that can be saved. This is a \$157,111,700 deficiency bill. The other day we had before us a \$763,000,000 bill and the last bill we took up carried \$331,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. But just what advantage is gained by printing it in the RECORD in fine type?

Mr. BLANTON. The people of the country have the right to know what is in these bills, and just how we are appropriating their billions, and the only chance they have of knowing what is in them—except by sending here and getting copies of them—is to have them printed in the RECORD. There are 40,000 prominent, regular readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day in the United States and their copies are read by many others. They are the ones who help to pay the expenses of the Government and they should know what is in these bills; and the country press having access to the RECORD may discuss the various items in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that, but honestly I can not see any good result by printing them in fine type.

Mr. BLANTON. My judgment is that eventually it will save millions of dollars for the Government.

Mr. SNELL. And my judgment is it will not save a cent, but will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, that is an honest difference of opinion. I insist upon printing these bills in the RECORD because the law contemplates it. I am only demanding what the law provides.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to having the bill printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. With that understanding, I shall not object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois modifies his unanimous-consent request by including the request that the bill be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection to the request as modified?

There was no objection.

The bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

SENATE

Conveying votes of electors for President and Vice President: For the payment of the messengers of the respective States for conveying to the seat of government the votes of the electors of said States for President and Vice President of the United States, at a rate of 25

cents for every mile of the estimated distance by the most usual roads traveled from the place of meeting of the electors to the seat of government of the United States, computed for one distance only, \$14,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To pay the widow of William S. Greene, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, \$7,500.

To pay the widow of Julius Kahn, late a Representative from the State of California, \$7,500.

To pay the widow of Edward C. Little, late a Representative from the State of Kansas, \$7,500.

The foregoing appropriations shall be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUPREME COURT

For such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and its officers, including the furnishing and collecting of evidence where the United States is or may be a party in interest, and including such expenses other than for personal services as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, \$20,500, payable in the manner prescribed for defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia by the District of Columbia appropriation act approved June 7, 1924.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to meet the emergencies caused by forest insects within national parks and national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and to provide personnel and equipment for the investigation, control, and prevention of spread of such insects, to be expended directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government or with States, \$25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1926.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MISCELLANEOUS

Enforcement of acts to regulate commerce: For salary and expenses of assistant to the Solicitor General in representing the Government in all matters arising under the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, including traveling expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, including salaries of employees in the District of Columbia, \$500.

Pueblo Lands Board: For expenses of the Pueblo Lands Board, including compensation for member appointed by the President of the United States, and for clerical assistants, interpreters, and stenographers, rental of quarters, travel expenses, fees of witnesses, telephone and telegraph service, \$12,500.

JUDICIAL

UNITED STATES COURTS

The appropriation of \$9,000 for supplies for United States courts, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, is hereby made available for the fiscal year 1925.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

NAVAL OBSERVATORY

For installation of 8-inch water mains for fire protection, \$15,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PUBLISHING ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Not exceeding \$2,000 of the appropriation for printing and binding, Department of State, fiscal year 1925, shall be available to pay the expenses of publishing in compliance with the requirements of the act of February 3, 1887, the certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors for the President and Vice President of the United States as transmitted by the executive of each State to the Secretary of State.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

For refunding taxes illegally collected under the provisions of sections 3220 and 3689, Revised Statutes, as amended by the acts of February 24, 1919, November 23, 1921, and June 2, 1924, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1926 and prior years, \$150,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1926: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress of the disbursements hereunder as required by such acts.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emer-

agency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, including the purchase of newspapers and clippings from newspapers containing information relating to the prevalence of disease and the public health, \$275,000, to remain available until June 30, 1926.

COAST GUARD

Repair of vessels: For necessary emergent repairs to the cutter *Manning*, \$150,000.

Office of commandant: For personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$7,500.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Paris, Tex., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$61,000.

WAR DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Of the unexpended balance of the appropriation provided by section 124 of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended, the sum of \$15,000 is hereby made available for such expenses as may be necessary and incidental to the arbitration of the rate of royalty to be paid the American Cyanamid Co. on patents owned by said company, as provided in section 10 of the contract of June 8, 1918, between the United States and the American Cyanamid Co.

MUSCLE SHOALS

For the continuation of the work on Dam No. 2, on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., \$3,501,200.

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

For the purchase of capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation created by the act approved June 3, 1924, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Sec. 2. This act hereafter may be referred to as the "first deficiency act, fiscal year 1925."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, agreed to by the House, general debate is limited to one hour and a half, and the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one-half of that time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill carries \$157,111,700. One hundred and fifty million dollars of the amount is recommended to be appropriated for the return of taxes illegally collected by the Government.

It may be interesting for the House to know that since 1917, when war was declared, there has been collected in internal-revenue taxes \$27,599,431,245.56, and of this \$2,539,336,147 has been collected on schedules which at the time of their payment were underpaid, and at the same time there has been paid in return to the taxpayers \$404,871,672.72 on schedules that were overpaid by taxpayers. So that while the audits of the schedules filed by taxpayers since 1917 have made it necessary to return to taxpayers over \$404,000,000 on account of overpayment, the audits have enabled the Government to collect on schedules where underpayments were made over \$2,539,000,000. While the Committee on Appropriations comes to the House every once in a while with a recommendation for the expenditure of large sums in deficiency bills for the payment to the taxpayers of illegally collected taxes, it is not usually known by the House that, while the audits disclose conditions which require these payments of returns, we acquire information through the audits which enables the Treasury to collect a sum more than six times as much on underpayments as the Treasury is called upon to pay on overpayments. I hope I have made that situation clear.

The Treasury has been auditing claims for refund and at the same time auditing claims where the Government itself is demanding further payments in thousands of such claims every year since the war.

It is not known at the time these appropriations are made to whom the money will be paid, for the audits have not been made at the time we request the appropriation, but the audits are going on constantly every day and during the last year they have resulted in an ascertainment of amounts due from the Treasury to the taxpayers averaging about ten and a half million dollars a month.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If these audits have not been made and the money is not due, why is this item carried in a deficiency bill instead of in a regular bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, there have been audits made—

Mr. SNELL. For \$7,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Amounting to \$7,000,000 and they have money with which to pay \$947,000. This can not be carried in the regular bill because all moneys to be carried in a regular bill must of necessity be ascertainable; that is, the

uses to which they are to be put must be definitely ascertainable over the next fiscal year.

Mr. SNELL. And because these amounts are not definitely ascertainable they are carried in a deficiency bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Not only that, but audits are being made every day, and while the evidence before us showed they had over 7,000 accounts already audited and involving \$7,000,000, every day adds to the number and to the amount. I would like to say another thing to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. Under the law every taxpayer who has overpaid his account is entitled to 6 per cent a year on his payments which were above the amount he should have paid from the day he paid until the day the claim is approved by the commissioner, and this amounts to a very large sum in the aggregate. It is also proper to say that when the taxpayer has underpaid his account he is subject to the provisions of the law for penalties, interest, and so forth, for failure to pay the proper amount.

Mr. SNELL. The Government charges something extra, does it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALMON. The chairman has stated the audits show that these underpayments are six times as much as the overpayments. I want to know up to what time the audits have been carried—for what years have they carried on this work?

Mr. MADDEN. They are still auditing 1917, 1918, and 1919 cases. They would have completed 1917 and 1918, but the Congress authorized applications for refunds to be made by taxpayers up to a certain later date than the statute of limitations authorized, and as a result of that over 35,000 new applications have been filed for refund.

Mr. ALMON. Is the ratio of 6 to 1, to which the gentleman refers, the ratio for 1917, or for what year?

Mr. MADDEN. That is for all the years.

Mr. ALMON. For all the years since the war has it averaged that much?

Mr. MADDEN. The underpayments in 1917 amounted to \$16,000,000 and the overpayments or refunds amounted to \$887,000. In 1918 it was \$29,000,000 and \$2,000,000; in 1919, \$123,000,000 and \$8,654,000; in 1920 the underpayments amounted to \$466,889,000 and the amount of refunds was \$14,127,000; for 1921 the underpayments amounted to \$416,483,000 and the refunds amounted to \$28,656,000; for 1922, \$266,978,000 and \$48,134,000; for 1923, \$500,670,000 and \$123,992,000; and for 1924, \$577,710,000 as against \$137,006,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Would it disturb the gentleman if I asked him a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Owing to the ample appropriations made by the gentleman and his committee last spring for the prevention and stamping out of the foot-and-mouth disease which occurred in a neighboring State and afterwards in my home State, the work being under the supervision of Doctor Mohler, the gentleman at the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the foot-and-mouth disease was stamped out in Texas in two months.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to ask if there is still an unexpended balance.

Mr. MADDEN. There is \$3,000,000 available for use anywhere in the United States.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What is the explanation of the great increase in the refund in 1923 and 1924?

Mr. MADDEN. On account of the increase in the audits—on account of the new law that requires interest to be paid by the Government from the day of payment until final approval. Whereas before it was only 6 per cent from the date of filing the claim, now it is 6 per cent for the payment of tax, and on 1917 cases that makes 36 per cent.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman states that in the case of a refund they pay interest only to the date of the audit, but when the boot is on the other leg the Government demands interest up to the time of payment. I have heard much criticism of the Government for not paying interest up to the time payment is received.

Mr. MADDEN. All we can do is to comply with the law.

Mr. LUCE. That is the law and not a Treasury regulation?

Mr. MADDEN. That is the law.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRIGGS. Can the gentleman give us any idea when the audits are to be completed for the years 1917 and 1918, when the taxpayers may know that the settlement is completed?

Mr. MADDEN. If Congress does not enlarge the opportunity for filing new claims—

Mr. BRIGGS. I mean under the existing law.

Mr. MADDEN. It is hoped that it will be within a year. Now, as to the continuation of the work on Muscle Shoals—for continuation of the work on Dam No. 2, \$3,501,200. That together with \$3,040,000 carried in the Army bill will complete the authorized amount to be appropriated for the Wilson Dam No. 2, which will be completed some time between now and midsummer to the extent of having the gates in and the wheels in and everything in readiness to turn the power on at the end of the dam.

The next item is \$3,000,000 toward the capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation. That corporation was organized by Congress. It is a Government corporation authorized to operate transportation facilities on the Mississippi River and on the Warrior River. They are confined to operating on these two rivers. The capital stock of the corporation was fixed at \$5,000,000. The corporation has two large towboats drawing 8 feet 3 inches of water. These boats are being operated on the Mississippi River. For nine months in the year the water in which they run is deep enough to accommodate the draft of these boats. For three months in the year it is too shoal. For nine months in the year when the water is of sufficient depth the corporation makes money; for the other three months of the year when they are on sand bars and unable to function they lose the money that they made in the previous nine months.

Now what they want is the money—for they have the authority—to build two additional towboats with less draft than those they now have. Then they propose to use the two additional boats, say from Memphis toward St. Louis, where the water is shoal, and to use the deep-draft boats down where the water is deep. They say that with the new equipment and additional steam barges, both for the Mississippi River and the Warrior River on which they operate, they will be able to make the corporation a profitable institution.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is it contemplated to have the corporation do any work north of St. Louis?

Mr. MADDEN. They will go as far as they can. The evidence we took related only from St. Louis down.

The next item is \$275,000 to enable the Public Health Service to fight the bubonic plague at New Orleans and at Oakland, Calif. They have discovered rats in New Orleans affected with bubonic plague. When a rat dies, affected by bubonic plague, the fleas which he carries with him will leave him as soon as he dies. If these fleas by any chance bite a human being, that human being is then affected with the bubonic plague. Around Oakland, Calif., they have discovered rats that are afflicted with bubonic plague, and there is an effort being made by the State and health departments to eradicate this danger to the public health of the country. It may be that a larger sum than this will be required at no distant day, but no one can tell.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. There is an item before that with reference to the refund by the Treasury Department?

Mr. MADDEN. I was following the report and not the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. I was following the bill, and the Public Health Service comes after the internal revenue, concerning which I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. Is not the item of \$150,000,000 refund of taxes an indication of pretty bad guessing on the part of the Treasury Department in making the original levy?

Mr. MADDEN. No; this has nothing to do with the levying of the taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I have only five minutes more in which to discuss this question, and I will try to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] in that time. If the gentleman makes a personal income-tax schedule and files it with the Treasury Department, he sends a check for the amount that he figures he owes the Treasury on the income tax. These schedules then are finally audited and when they

are audited, it is frequently ascertained that the taxpayer has paid more than he should have paid in making his calculations.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman does not mean to be understood as saying that this item refers only to that character of assessment?

Mr. MADDEN. But I do.

Mr. DOWELL. But the department is continually checking up these books and requiring the payment of taxes.

Mr. MADDEN. I explained all that a few moments ago when, I suppose, the gentleman was not in the Chamber.

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, I was present. The taxpayer then appeals to the department to have a refund after they have been checked by the agents of the department. What I am getting at is, is there not a better system or can not the system be improved of paying in these vast sums of money that the Treasury Department now claims are not due, and have a more nearly correct statement of the actual facts in the beginning of the transaction?

Mr. MADDEN. There is not a way in the world by which it can be done. There are millions of schedules on file. Schedules are being audited every day, and every time a schedule is audited the discovery is made as to whether or not the man who made the schedule owes the Government or the Government owes the man. This \$150,000,000 is to pay in the cases where the Government owes the man, after the ascertainment of the facts.

Mr. DOWELL. But are not these facts ascertained before the payment is made by the agent who makes that assessment?

Mr. MADDEN. But this is not an assessment.

Mr. DOWELL. I mean, finding the amount.

Mr. MADDEN. No; they could not. There is no way in the world to do it other than this. Some of these schedules are five or six years behind in the audits.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand that, but is there not a way of catching this up so that they will not be that far behind?

Mr. MADDEN. They would not have been so far behind if it were not for the fact that Congress enlarged the right of the taxpayers to make application for a refund when the statute of limitations ran against them. Congress passed an act to give them further opportunity to apply, and we have had 35,000 additional applications for refunds as a result of the action of Congress.

As long as Congress continues to open the door the Treasury Department will have to pay. There is no doubt about that. There is no way in the world by which you can ascertain the facts in advance.

Mr. DOWELL. What I am getting at is this: Some of the taxpayers protest against the amount of taxes that they are compelled to pay.

Mr. MADDEN. That is in cases where levies have been made.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Where they have to pay the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And not where the Government has to pay them.

Mr. DOWELL. And where they do pay the Government and where the agent advises them that they have to come to Washington to get their refund. In fact, they do, and in many cases do get the refund.

Mr. MADDEN. That has nothing to do with this case at all. The gentleman's statement does not relate to this matter at all. A refund is one thing and an underpayment is another. In the cases to which the gentleman refers the Government has collected from the taxpayers \$2,536,000,000 in new assessments where underpayments have been made. While they have been doing that they have paid back to the taxpayers \$404,000,000 where overpayments have been made on the schedules. I can not take any more time, because my time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time. I have yielded all of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied 25 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this deficiency bill is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations simply to carry what might be called urgent matters which need immediate attention and immediate appropriation. Later on there

will be what is known as a general deficiency appropriation bill, which will take up other deficiencies that may be submitted from the Bureau of the Budget. There is no contest over any of the provisions of this bill, unless it be one item relating to the Inland Waterways Corporation, to which I understand there will be some objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For a brief question.

Mr. SNELL. When we authorized that I did not understand that it was necessary to make any appropriation out of the funds of the Government to take care of the situation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is an authorization by law on the part of the Government to the extent of \$5,000,000 for subscription to the capital stock of this corporation. In other words, when the corporation was formed, it was organized with a capital stock of \$5,000,000, the Government to be the sole stockholder. No money has ever been appropriated to be applied on that stock. The Budget Bureau submitted an estimate of \$3,000,000 of the \$5,000,000, and the committee, acting under the authority of Congress and the law, has felt it proper to recommend that appropriation to the House.

Mr. SNELL. As I understood the situation, when it was presented before the Committee on Rules and when it was presented on the floor of the House, it was simply a transfer of property and did not call for any appropriation from the Federal Government, that the Government already owned the property, and it was simply a transfer of that property to this new corporation, so that they could better carry on their business.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be true, but at the same time the Government authorized \$5,000,000 of stock to be subscribed by the Government. This is simply carrying out the law as passed by the Congress.

Mr. SNELL. What becomes of this \$3,000,000 in money?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has already explained that they need two new towboats which will have less draft than the towboats they now have, owing to the fact that for three months in the year the present towboats have such a heavy draft that they frequently run aground.

Now, the proposition is to buy two new towboats, I think, at a cost of \$800,000, or to construct them, which will have a less draft and will enable the corporation to do business all the year around on that reach of the Mississippi between Memphis and St. Louis, and use the heavier towboats on the lower reaches of the river where the channel is deeper. In addition to this, new barges are to be purchased for both the Mississippi and the Warrior Rivers.

Mr. SNELL. I can not understand why the statement was made that it would not require an appropriation, that it was simply for the transfer of property, and that now we should start immediately and appropriate money. I can not get that through my mind.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. At the same time Congress did actually authorize the subscription of \$5,000,000, and the committee had no alternative except to report the appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Yes, but the statement was made before us, if I am not mistaken—I may be—that it is simply a transfer of property and that we created that new corporation to take over the present business, and that the only reason for doing so was to put the Government in a position to work as any other corporation, borrow money, and do business without so much red tape.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not question the statement made by the gentleman. I have stated what the act provides, and the committee has simply acted under the authorization given under that act in reporting this appropriation.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will briefly.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. At what valuation was the property which was turned over by the Inland Waterway Corporation turned over in payment for stock—at any particular value?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not recall that it was turned over in payment of stock. I think the valuation of the corporation property, or rather the Government property, was at this time two or three million dollars and is now estimated to be worth over \$9,000,000, but that is subject to correction, for I am simply stating it from memory. The hearings will show the gentleman, and if he will read the hearing on the subject it will give him the full facts.

Now, gentlemen, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] stated, there has been collected on income taxes from 1917 to

1924, inclusive, nearly \$27,000,000,000. The total amount of back taxes collected up to July 1 was \$2,498,590,294. The total refund made up to July 1 of last year was \$363,546,494.98. That is 1.3 per cent of the total amount of income taxes collected and 15.9 per cent of the total amount of back taxes collected.

That is a very good showing, and I want to take occasion to say here I think the Treasury Department is doing all it can to speed the consideration of these claims for tax refunds. My recollection is that it was stated last year that the department would be as near current as possible by next July, but Congress, as has been stated, has repeatedly extended the time for filing claims. In the act of 1924 it extended the time for filing claims for 1917 and 1918, which brought in 35,000 new cases which had theretofore been closed. The result is that the Internal Revenue Bureau now states on account of these extensions, if no new laws are passed providing for additional extensions, it will take 28 months to get the work current. And that is due, as I say, to the fact that Congress made these extensions, of course entailing new work upon the department. I wish to repeat that in my opinion I believe the Internal Revenue Commissioner is doing everything in his power to speed the consideration of these claims. They now, as you know, under the act of 1924, draw interest at 6 per cent up to the time they are actually approved by the Internal Revenue Commissioner, and, of course, it is exceedingly important that these claims be speedily disposed of, because the interest will amount possibly to \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 next year.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Briefly.

Mr. SPEAKS. Is there a list published showing by name the individuals and corporations to whom these refunds are made?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think that is published, but, of course, that list is on file with the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. SPEAKS. But not published in any manner?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I think not. The Senate committee has been investigating that subject and I think probably have obtained a list of those names.

Mr. SPEAKS. Does not the gentleman think there should be such a list published to go out to the public for its information?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think it should certainly be made available to anyone who wants it. This bill carries \$150,000,000 for tax refunds, which it is presumed will be sufficient to carry the department and make all the refunds up until December 31, 1925. That includes, of course, \$12,000,000 that was eliminated from the Treasury bill the other day and which has been usually carried from year to year in the appropriation. The last appropriation made for tax refund was made in the deficiency bill in April, 1924, at the last session of Congress. There was appropriated at that time \$105,467,000. On July 1 the department had an unexpended balance of \$43,405,446.57.

Congress passed, as you will recall, a resolution providing for the return to the taxpayers of 25 per cent of the amount paid by them. The deficiency bill which failed to become a law in June carried an appropriation of \$16,100,000 to make that return of taxes legally collected for 1923 but ordered to be returned to the taxpayers, because it was felt that the taxes could be reduced to that extent. There was, therefore, no specific appropriation to make this return before the presidential election in November, and I was somewhat surprised to learn that of this \$43,405,446.57 which was available July 1 under an appropriation made for refunding taxes illegally collected more than \$17,000,000—or, to be exact, \$17,320,582.74—had been applied between July 1, 1924, and October 1, 1924, to the return of this 25 per cent of taxes which were legally collected in 1924 for the year 1923.

The CHAIRMAN. The time suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will take five minutes more.

I was unable to understand how the Treasury Department could apply an appropriation made to refund taxes illegally collected toward the payment of taxes legally collected, but ordered returned by Congress in the nature of what might be called a gratuity. I was told that it was done under an opinion of the Comptroller General. The appropriation of \$16,000,000—an appropriation which was intended specifically to take care of the 25 per cent return—having failed in June, the Comptroller General of the United States rendered an opinion in which he held that this unexpended balance of \$43,000,000 could be applied to that particular purpose, and

that notwithstanding there were approved claims of taxpayers who possibly had been before the department for two or three or four years pressing their claims for taxes illegally collected and taken out of their pockets and which were not drawing interest after they were approved by the Internal Revenue Commissioner, these claims were allowed to pass along and have not yet been paid but have been forced to await the passage of this appropriation, because on November 1, 1924, the department found itself in the position of having no money with which to pay some \$16,989,000 of approved claims by the Internal Revenue Commissioner, whereas if it had applied this appropriation as it was made and intended by Congress all these claims would have been paid either on or before November 1, 1924. It is very clear why that course was pursued when I tell you that there were 2,576,664 persons who had paid their 1923 income taxes and to whom this refund of 25 per cent was made between July 1 and October 1, 1924, or just prior to the presidential election.

I was somewhat astounded that the Comptroller General had rendered that opinion, and I asked that a copy of it be furnished to the committee, and I find that he bases his opinion on what appears to me to be a very strained and unsatisfactory interpretation of the law. The only reason he gives for his opinion is—and I will use his language—

Though the taxes authorized to be refunded by the revenue act of June 2, 1924, were taxes legally collected, the word "illegally" as used in the phrase "refunding taxes illegally collected," appearing in the appropriation act in question, has not been considered or construed to have a restricted meaning so as to authorize the refundment only of collections made contrary to law, but rather to authorize refundment when it is definitely determined that there had been collected from the taxpayers funds not authorized to be retained.

It is evident why this course was followed. The opinion of the Comptroller General was at most permissive only. But the administration took advantage of it in order to communicate with more than 2,500,000 persons just before the election at public expense, for the return checks and accompanying letter were sent free of postage. And it did so to the very great injustice of claimants who had taxes taken from them illegally, for they have been forced to wait until now for payment, because the money which had been appropriated to pay their just claims was diverted for purposes never intended.

I want to say this in conclusion, that I have been very heartily in favor of the Budget system. It happens that I was a member of the Budget committee and took an humble part in helping to frame that law. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was also a member. It was the unanimous intention of that committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, that the Budget law should be passed and should be administered without reference to partisanship; and for that reason, and that sole reason, Congress provided that the Comptroller General should be named for a period of 15 years, not to be removed save by concurrent resolution of the House and Senate and signed by the President, and he was given a salary of \$12,000, with the idea of obtaining at the head of that great governmental activity a man not only qualified to administer the law, not only qualified to pass upon the appropriations made by Congress—and he is the supreme court in regard to the action of the departments in paying out money—but also one who would be free from any influence of politics or partisanship, and who would not be swayed one way or the other by whatever effect his action would have upon a political party or as to how it might affect any administration. Under the Budget law the Comptroller General is supposed to represent Congress rather than the administration. His construction as to the purposes of appropriations is binding upon the departments. No lawyer can read his opinion without being dissatisfied with it as a proper legal interpretation or without being impressed with the suspicion that he was trying to find a way for the administration to use this fund before the election in a manner which it thought would be of some benefit to it in the election. I regret to see it, for in my judgment any evidence of partisan use of the Budget system is calculated to do more than any other one thing to destroy it.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman will recall that in the last revenue measure a provision was made for a Board of Tax Appeals, of 25 members, if I recollect, and rather high-salaried members, it is true. I understand that that board was organized, and organized with the character and dignity of sets of rules that make it extremely difficult for an ordinary person

to get any consideration of a tax appeal unless the case is prepared and somebody is employed to represent him who is technically efficient in that sort of thing.

Is that true or not? It seems to me the Board of Tax Appeals was created so as to give the taxpayers as well as the Government an impartial administrative board, so that if you had only the records of the Treasury they ought to be sufficient, it seems to me, when setting out questions of error and propositions of law connected with a claim. I would like to know about that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is correct as to the intention of Congress, and so far as the information I have goes, I think the Board of Tax Appeals is proceeding as rapidly as it can. I know nothing about any rules which it has adopted. Naturally the Board of Tax Appeals must have some rules to guide it, because it is in the nature of an appellate court, so far as these tax-refund matters are concerned.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that not long ago the tax board stated that it had practically nothing to do; that the taxpayers were not coming before it on appeals. If that is true, I think it is entirely due to the technical procedure required.

Mr. MADDEN. They have had 1,000 cases presented to them and they have just adjudicated 100.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, and I think the board of appeals is proceeding as rapidly as it can, because it has been functioning for only a short while. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says, it has already disposed of 100 cases out of 1,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. There may be many thousands of appeals, and I understand the Treasury Department reviews these cases without requiring a brief to be filed, simply reviewing them upon the complaint made, and it seems to me the Board of Tax Appeals should follow the same procedure.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand the Board of Tax Appeals is hearing the cases which have been appealed to it as fast as it can. It seems to me it is entirely proper that those who take an appeal should file some sort of a memorandum, or you might call it a brief, and I think that in practically every case they desire to do that in order to bring the facts before the board.

Mr. BRIGGS. That may be true, but I think the taxpayers who desire to make an appeal should be permitted to file an informal statement or complaint and have their cases heard upon that statement or complaint. I think the Board of Tax Appeals should pass on them just as the Treasury Department passes on them, namely, without requiring the submission of any brief. Why should the board of appeals require any brief? It is simply a set of tax experts sitting there to hear appeals.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it that if the taxpayer who takes an appeal does not care to file a brief, that the Board of Tax Appeals will, of course, pass upon his case without requiring that to be done. But I think it is in the interest of the taxpayer himself—if he wants to have his case fully considered from every standpoint—that he should file a brief or memorandum setting forth the reasons why he thinks injustice has been done.

Mr. BRIGGS. That would be perfectly proper if the amount involved were sufficiently large to require that; but I think the appeals of taxpayers should be heard without the necessity of filing briefs.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DARROW). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, a paragraph in the present appropriation bill reminds us that not until next Monday—the second Monday in January—will any votes be cast directly for the election of the next President and Vice President of the United States. I refer to the item of \$14,000 for payment of messengers who bring the electoral votes from their respective States to the seat of government "at the rate of 25 cents per mile of the estimated distance by the most usual roads traveled from the place of meeting of the electors to the seat of government of the United States." This is a provision of the act of 1792 and is still in force.

This appropriation should be saved. At the time of the enactment of the law the Post Office Department had just been created, and the only method of transmitting the certificates of the electors was by stage coach or on horseback, whether sent by messenger or by the Postal Service. To-day the mails are just as safe as messengers, and the difference in cost to the taxpayers is the \$14,000 herein sought to be appropriated. The

transmission of electoral votes by messenger, a necessity in 1792, is a waste of money to-day.

Opinions of the delegates to the Federal Convention differed as to the need of a Chief Executive. During the period of the Continental Congress—1774-1781—aside from Washington as military commander, no head of the Government was recognized. The delegates finally concluded there should be an Executive. The next question considered was, Should such Executive be appointed or elected? Different plans were proposed—election by the National Legislature, election by the Senate, appointment by electors chosen by the people or by the State legislatures, or election directly by the people.

Considerable opposition was evidenced to election by the people, as "The people would never be sufficiently informed of the character of men to vote intelligently for candidates that might be presented," or "The people would be incited by designing and active demagogues," or, as another delegate said, "It would be as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper person for President to the people as to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." The delegates were just as unwilling that Congress should have a part in the selection of a Chief Executive. The electoral plan, an exact counterpart of the joint convention of the two Houses, was adopted. Fearing that so large a number of men would not travel to the seat of government for the single purpose of casting their vote, it was provided that the electors should meet and cast their votes in their own several States, the act of voting to be followed by transmitting the votes sealed to the seat of government, where, in the presence of the two Houses, the votes were to be counted.

The constitutional provision—article 2, section 1, paragraph 2—finally adopted provided:

Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector.

The manner of the appointment of the electors to which each State is entitled was thus vested in the legislature of the State. No obligation was imposed upon a State to provide for the appointment of electors. In fact, the State of New York, in the first election of 1789, failed to appoint electors, as the two houses could not agree upon the method, and so New York lost its electoral vote in that election. Rhode Island and North Carolina, having failed to ratify the Constitution, took no part in that election. In other States the manner of appointing controlled the nomination, depending upon the political complexion of the legislature. In some States electors were appointed by the legislature; in others by district ticket, and in still others by the electoral ticket.

The Constitution further provides that the day on which the electors shall give their vote "shall be the same throughout the United States." The plan contemplated was to have the electors of each State meet in that State and cast a secret ballot on the same day upon which the electors convened in all other States, the intent being that each separate electoral college should, when making its choice, be unaware of the decision of the others. A directly opposite result occurred. The electors as candidates are pledged to vote for a certain person for President and another person for Vice President and to violate the pledge would constitute political treason to the party and to the people. In fact, Mr. Horace Greeley, candidate of the Democratic Party for President in 1872, having died before the college met to vote, the votes of the electors in the Georgia college were nevertheless actually cast for him.

The Constitution provides that—

The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying same.

When the ratification of nine States was secured the Congress of the Confederation fixed the first Wednesday of January, 1789, as the day for appointing electors in the several States which, before that date, should have ratified the Constitution; the first Wednesday in February as the day for the electors to assemble in their respective States and vote for a President; and the first Wednesday in March as the time and the seat of Government (New York) the place for commencing proceedings under the Constitution.

The first Wednesday in March, 1789, happened to be on the 4th. As the President holds for four years, the 4th of March has become a fixed day and it is now so provided by law as the beginning of his term. Congress attempted to assemble in New York on March 4, 1789. It was not until April 6, 1789, that a quorum (12 Senators) in the Senate was obtained.

John Langdon was elected President pro tempore of the Senate for the sole purpose of opening the certificates and counting the votes of the electors of the several States in the choice of a President and Vice President of the United States. The Senate appointed one of their Members to sit at the Clerk's table to make a list of the votes as they were declared. The House likewise appointed two Members for the same purpose and attended in the Senate Chamber. The President of the Senate opened the votes and declared the result to the two Houses.

There was no contest over the election of a President. Washington was the unanimous choice of all. At that time the electors could vote for two persons for President, the person receiving the greatest number of votes being declared President and the person receiving the second greatest number being declared Vice President. That there were favorite-son candidates then as now is shown by the vote, which is as follows:

Washington, 69; Adams, 34; Samuel Huntington, 2; John Jay, 9; John Hancock, 4; Robert H. Harrison, 6; George Clinton, 3; John Rutledge, 6; John Milton, 2; James Armstrong, 1; Edward Telfair, 1; and Benjamin Lincoln, 1.

At the suggestion of Mr. Madison, a committee of the Senate was appointed to notify George Washington of his election to the office of President and John Adams of his election to the office of Vice President. On April 30, 1789, George Washington, in the presence of the Senate and the House, took the oath of office as required by the Constitution, and, following a short address by him, the record discloses that "the President, the Vice President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives," and so forth, "then proceeded to St. Paul's Chapel, where divine service was performed by the Chaplain of Congress, after which the President was reconducted to his house by the committee appointed for that purpose."

In 1800 the election resulted in a tie between Jefferson and Burr, each receiving 73 votes, with Adams receiving 65, Pinckney 64, and John Jay 1. The electoral system thus failed to function. A majority of all votes was necessary. After the thirty-sixth ballot, the vote being taken by States, and each State having one vote, Jefferson was elected President and Burr Vice President. An amendment to the Constitution (Art. XII) was promptly ratified, so that instead of voting for two persons for President, the electors should directly designate the person voted for for President and the person voted for for Vice President.

It is also provided that when no person had a majority of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the person having the highest numbers, not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives should immediately choose by ballot the President; that if the House shall not choose the President when the right of choice devolves upon them, before the 4th day of March next following, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of death or other constitutional disability of the President. There is considerable dispute as to whether the Vice President referred to means the Vice President then in office or the Vice President elect. In event no person receive a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for Vice President, then from the two highest on the list the Senate shall choose the Vice President.

Later the electoral system again failed. In the election of 1824 the vote of the Electoral College stood—Jackson, 99; Adams, 84; Crawford, 4; Clay, 37. Jackson received a plurality but not the required majority. The House, voting by States, elected Adams. The popular vote had been Jackson, 155,872; Adams, 105,321. Another failure was the famous Hayes-Tilden controversy. Hayes was declared elected, although Tilden received 250,000 more votes than Hayes. Again, in 1888 Cleveland received almost 100,000 more of the popular vote than Harrison, yet the latter was elected.

The time of "appointing" electors is determined by Congress under authority of the Constitution, as on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President. The number of electors shall be equal to the number of Senators and Representatives to which the several States are, by law, entitled at the time when the President and Vice President to be chosen come into office. The executive of the State shall promptly prepare certificates or credentials of election of the electors, together with the names of all the candidates for electors and the votes of each, and send one list at once to the secretary of state at the seat of government, who is required by law to publish the same in some newspaper. The executive also prepares such certificate or credentials in triplicate.

The second Monday in January the electors of each State meet and give their votes. (Over two months after the time when the people have actually determined who is to be President and Vice President.) The electors make and sign three certificates of all the votes given by them, which certificates contain two distinct lists—one of the votes for President, the other of the votes for Vice President—and annex to each of the certificates one of the sets of credentials furnished by the executive. The certificates are sealed up by the electors and certified to. The law then provides that the electors shall dispose of the certificates as follows: One by sending same to the seat of government by messenger; a second by post office; and the third certificate is deposited with the judge of that district in which the electors shall assemble.

The Secretary of State is required, if the President of the Senate fails to receive a certificate of votes from any State by the fourth Monday in January, to send a special messenger to the district judge in whose custody the one certificate of the votes from that State has been lodged. Certificates have also been sent by express companies to the President of the Senate.

The certain delivery of the certificates being thus safeguarded by law, the need for messengers and the expenditure of money to cover their trips to Washington no longer exists.

On the second Wednesday in February the Senate and the House of Representatives meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon on that day. The President of the Senate is the presiding officer. There are four tellers, two appointed by the Senate and two by the House. The President of the Senate opens and presents the certificates to the tellers, and the tellers read the result in the presence and hearing of the two Houses and enumerate the result. The President of the Senate then announces the state of the vote, which announcement is deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President. Four years ago the entire proceedings consumed less than 40 minutes and, omitting the tabulation by States, the record is as follows:

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by their Sergeant at Arms and headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the two Houses of Congress, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, are now in joint convention for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedents, unless demand shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been had that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the States.

Twelve years ago, upon an occasion similar to this, the then Vice President of the United States, my warm personal friend, Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana, suppressed any manifestation of approval or disapproval upon the part of the galleries or the members of the joint convention, announcing at that time what seemed to me to be a proper statement, that this is a solemn and important occasion in the affairs of the people of America, and it should be discharged with dignity and in silence.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk. The tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the State of Alabama.

Mr. LODGE (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that James M. Cox, of Ohio, received 12 votes for President and Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, 12 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with, and the chair will open in alphabetical order the certificates showing the electoral votes of each State, and the tellers will count and make announcement of the results in the several States.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in their alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the President of the Senate.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the result:

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.

FLORIAN LAMPERT,
WILLIAM W. RUCKER,

Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the report of the state of the vote as delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Warren G. Harding, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 404 votes.

James M. Cox, of the State of Ohio, has received 127 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States as delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Calvin Coolidge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for Vice President of the United States 404 votes.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 127 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Gentlemen of the convention, the purposes for which this joint convention was called having been accomplished, as presiding officer I dissolve this joint convention, and the Senate will return to its Chamber.

The Senate (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) retired from the Hall, and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Speaker resumed the chair and called the House to order.

Has the electoral system failed? Should it be abolished? The original idea that electors themselves should deliberate and choose and elect a President and a Vice President has not been followed. They have sought to carry out the will of a majority of the voters. Presidents have been elected by a majority of the electoral votes but by only a plurality of the popular vote.

In 1844 James K. Polk fell short of a majority of the popular vote by 24,119. In New York his plurality over Clay was 5,106. Thus, a change of 2,504 votes would have given the State's electoral vote to Clay.

In 1856 Buchanan lacked a majority of the popular vote but carried Pennsylvania by a majority of 513 votes. Had Pennsylvania gone to Fremont or Fillmore, Buchanan would have lacked two electoral votes of the required majority.

Abraham Lincoln fell short of a majority by almost 500,000, but secured a majority of the electoral vote. Douglass received more than a million and a third popular votes, which gave him but 12 electors in the college, while Breckinridge received 847,953 votes, which gave him 72 electors.

In 1884 a change in New York of 575 popular votes from Cleveland to Blaine would have elected Blaine by an electoral majority of 17 votes.

In 1888 a change of 6,502 votes in New York from Harrison to Cleveland would have given the Presidency to Cleveland. Cleveland received almost 100,000 more of the popular vote than Harrison.

Under the present system the State of New York has 45 electoral votes. There are 12 States—Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Vermont, Utah, and Wyoming—whose combined electoral vote equals that of New York, yet the population of these 12 States is less than one-half that of New York. If an election should be thrown into the House because no person should receive a majority of the electoral vote, then the people of these 12 States could outvote the people of New York 12 to 1, for in the House each State has but one vote.

If the present electoral system continues—and it can only be changed by constitutional amendment—sooner or later the following questions will have to be answered by enactment of constitutional amendments and laws by Congress:

(a) Does the Secretary of State succeed to the Presidency if for any reason there is no constitutionally elected President by March 4?

(b) Shall there be a special election? Or does the person succeeding to the Presidency fill out the unexpired term?

(c) If the election were ordered in case of a vacancy in the office, could it be for the unexpired term or would it have to be for a term of four years, thus disarranging the four-year period of the Government?

(d) Does the commission of a Cabinet officer expire on March 4, and would this prevent succession?

(e) For what length of time would a Cabinet officer act as President?

(f) Shall the choice of a Chief Executive be intrusted to the House of Representatives about to go out of existence when such House may even be under control of the party defeated at the preceding November election?

(g) Where the President elect dies before the second Wednesday in February, may the House of Representatives elect a President?

(h) In case of failure to count the votes and declare the results by the 4th of March, where the electors have not failed to elect but Congress has failed to declare the result, may the count continue?

(i) Would the Vice President or Vice President elect succeed to the Presidency should the President elect die before the 4th of March?

(j) Who would be President in case both President elect and Vice President elect should die before March 4?

(k) If more than three persons voted for as President should receive the highest number and an equal number of votes in the Electoral College, and suppose there were six candidates, three of whom had an equal number, who is to be preferred?

(l) If there should be more than two of the candidates for the Vice Presidency in a similar category, for how many then and for whom would the Senate vote?

(m) If a candidate for President should die after the election and before January 12 and before the electors met, how should they vote?

(n) If the President elect should die after the Electoral College has met and before Congress counted the vote, how could the vote be counted? Or could it be postponed?

If the electoral system is abolished, shall the direct vote be by districts, by States, or by the entire Nation?

Because of our "bloc" system it is not at all impossible that there may be more than two strong parties in this country. In event no candidate for President and for Vice President should receive, under a direct vote, a majority of the votes cast, who, then, would determine the election of a President? Should a plurality vote elect? Should there be a second run-off of the two or three highest? Or should the election then go to the House of Representatives as under the present system?

Many amendments have been introduced in Congress seeking to change the present electoral system. Some of these bills have passed the Senate and died in the House. The proper procedure to consider this momentous question would be to have a commission appointed consisting of students of election and the Constitution, who should make a thorough study of the subject and report their conclusions to Congress. As yet no better method of electing a President has been proposed, in my opinion, than our present Electoral College.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to the bill. The last item in this bill proposes an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the purchase of capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The bill creating the Inland Waterways Corporation came up at the last session of this Congress. Evidently, from the question just asked by the chairman on rules, the Committee on Rules permitted this bill to come up and to get a place on the calendar upon the theory that no appropriations were to be asked. The bill came from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], is the chairman, always until this time accurate in his predictions and accurate in his statements. I have great admiration for my friend, but the time has come for him to correct some statements he made on the floor of this House at that time.

I contended on the floor that this bill meant a charge upon the Treasury of \$5,000,000, and I was calling attention to the leases the corporation was already sustaining when speaking for the committee which had the bill in charge on the 16th day of last May. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] said:

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I will.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am not offering anything in opposition to what the gentleman is saying, but I want to find out if he really had in mind that the bill contemplated the appropriation of \$5,000,000 in real money.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; it does.

Mr. WINSLOW. Hardly.

Mr. RAINEY. What kind of money is it going to be?

Mr. WINSLOW. The proposition is to take the property that is floating around in the assets of the War Department, bring them together and transfer as a matter of bookkeeping to the corporation which will have the keeping of the \$5,000,000. Nobody ever expected \$5,000,000 new money would be appropriated. It will be an accounting matter, and only a small part of the \$5,000,000 will be needed in cash, and then not all at one time. It authorizes the use of that money, the purpose being to make the corporation an institution that can borrow money in time of a shortage and relieve the situation, and not to come to Congress to get money when it needs it, as it might take three months' time.

Mr. RAINEY. It will probably result in a Government appropriation very soon, because no private party is going to loan on a losing proposition any amount of money.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am not going to argue the matter with the gentleman. I am telling him what the bill means.

Mr. RAINEY. I am obliged to the gentleman for his contribution to my speech, and he always makes a valuable contribution whenever he interrupts.

This was the 16th day of last May. Congress adjourned soon afterwards. The gentleman was right about it, and the creation of this corporation was a proposition to enable it to borrow money from banks.

The corporation, according to the testimony before the committee, since its creation or since the 4th day of last June, when the bill was signed, has borrowed from banks \$650,000,000, and it is all gone except \$100,000, and now they come back at the very first opportunity, and before this Congress convened the Secretary of War requested the Budget Committee and the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate for this corporation \$3,000,000.

Mr. WINSLOW. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman to be interrupted?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman kindly go further and make a complete statement, as the gentleman is able to do, as to the credits and debits of the entire cash assets of the organization?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I will proceed to do that right now.

Mr. WINSLOW. With special reference to your statement that the \$650,000,000 is all gone.

Mr. RAINEY. This corporation started in, according to the testimony of Colonel Ashburn, now General Ashburn, with assets or with this floating equipment given to it by the Government. They figured that floating equipment at 5 cents per dollar on the cost to the Government represented an investment of \$650,000. That is the testimony of General Ashburn, and since that time, since General Ashburn commenced to operate these boats, the Government has appropriated over \$2,600,000, and that is all gone. Since the adjournment of the last session of this Congress they borrowed \$650,000, and that is all gone. And then they come here now with a statement showing that they need the entire \$5,000,000, and showing what they are going to do with it.

I want to give the figures to the committee, and I wish some members of the committee would follow this computation as I make it and tell me whether I am right about it or whether I am wrong about it. I want to submit to the committee this question. This is a question of accounting and here is a juggling of figures such as I have never before encountered. If the receipts from a business amounted to \$1,000 and the total expenses in conducting that business amounted to \$2,000, how much did they make? They did not make anything, of course. They lost \$1,000.

Let me call your attention to these figures which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations demanded should be submitted and which have been submitted. Let me call your attention to page 108 of the hearings as to the operations of the Mississippi River section by fiscal years:

Gross revenues for 1919, \$284,160.60;

Total expenses, \$706,328.65.

Now, how much did they make? They lost over \$422,000 that year.

Read the next line where they put it down as a net income of \$422,168.05. This was a loss, if it was anything, and then immediately under that they deduct the depreciation charge. This was another loss, of course. The way to estimate the losses for 1919 is to deduct the receipts from the expenses and then add the depreciation charges. Is not that the proper way? Of course it is.

They go through all the operations of the Warrior River service and the Mississippi River service in this same way and reach the conclusion that the net income of the Mississippi River service is \$2,469,674.44 for four years, and then they deduct depreciation charges from that, after having added together all the depreciation charges. That was not a net income, it was a loss for four years. I would like to see some member of the committee explain it in any other way.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. At some time will the gentleman kindly divide the period into that part before we had the act and that part which followed in order to contrast the losses and earnings of the two periods?

Mr. RAINEY. The losses have been increasing; the more money you give them the more money they lose.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman kindly answer my question?

Mr. RAINEY. I will answer the gentleman; I do not know that I can do it just now.

Mr. WINSLOW. Since we passed the act they have been earning money and before that they were losers?

Mr. RAINEY. They have been losing more than they earned.

Mr. WINSLOW. Have they not been getting nearer since we passed the act?

Mr. RAINEY. I will figure it out for the gentleman; I can not do it in this 15-minute speech. Now, if you add together the net loss and the depreciation loss it will amount to \$3,745,000 on the Mississippi River, and on both rivers it will amount to nearly \$7,000,000. You have to add some other items to that in order to find out how much money the barge service has really lost for the Government. The barge service is a loss to the Government and has clearly lost nearly \$5,000 every day of every year this service has been in operation. An accurate accounting would show the loss to be over \$6,000 per day. The more money you give it the more it is going to lose. They are trying to operate boats that are not adapted to the river. We have a company operating boats planned by private individuals and not by Government engineers, which are not of the type of boats which can be operated successfully.

As soon as Mr. Goltra completed his contract, which was made in 1919, he asked for a rate under which he could operate his barges. The Secretary of War said to him: "You can carry freight, but you must carry it at the railroad rate except for sand, coal, and clay, which you can carry at the rate the Government barges operate." He would not give him any better rate than that. Of course Mr. Goltra could not carry freight at rail rates when the Government barges were carrying it at less rates. They seized his barges, drove his men off with armed men, and ran the boats out of the jurisdiction of the court. General Ashburn refused to accept service of the courts in the proceedings brought immediately by Mr. Goltra to recover the barges, and the notice was thrown at his feet. Finally the court held that it could go beyond its jurisdiction and get the barges. This was done, and the barges were brought back and turned over to Mr. Goltra, and he is now operating the boats at a profit.

He demanded last week that the Secretary of War appoint the appraisers contemplated in the contract so that he could take over these towboats and barges. In spite of all of the efforts of the Government he has demonstrated that barge service on the Mississippi River can be made a success. Congress is making tremendous appropriations pouring money into that rat hole to enable incompetent people and engineers to make a demonstration on these rivers. In spite of everything that the Government has done, Mr. Goltra has demonstrated that his service is a success.

Now, I want to show you how the business of this corporation is conducted. In the examination General Ashburn was asked to state if loans had been made to cities for building terminals along the river. He said yes. He was asked if they were made without interest. He said at first they made them without interest, but they have quit that now and they are paying interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. RAINEY. They have loaned to cities \$866,000 and have loaned it on 20 or 30 year notes, absolutely without interest, except \$15,000 loaned to Vicksburg and \$15,000 loaned to Memphis. These boats are destroying the channels in the river. General Ashburn stated before the committee that he had not heard of any barges being held up on the river. I will tell you how they operate.

On December 4 the Goltra barges were proceeding down the river, towed by one of his towboats. They were carrying \$800,000 worth of wheat in one barge load down the river. When they got down to a landing 40 miles below St. Louis they found the river blocked by these Government boats on the road up. They were delayed there for four days waiting for a Government dredge to get there and dig them out. Then the dredge had to repair the channel destroyed by those boats. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] asked General Ashburn about that, and he did not know anything about it. He did not think anything of that kind had occurred. So I wired out there to know what the log of the steamer *Illinois*, of the Goltra Line, showed for that date. You can not run a barge line with this tremendous investment by a brigadier general here in Washington occupying his time attending functions. You must have some business man there running it. He did not even know that a tow of barges operated by the Goltra Line had been held up by his line in the river for four days. Here is the telegram:

ST. LOUIS, MO., January 5, 1925.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Log of the steamer *Illinois*, Goltra Barge Line, en route New Orleans with three barges of wheat in tow, shows that on the evening of December 8 she found the *Memphis*, of the Warrior Line, with a tow, bound upstream, and stalled in channel near Briceys, about 40 miles from here. *Illinois* and tow could not get by. The *Memphis* in attempting to work out, had ruined the channel, on account of her tunnel propeller wheels piling up ridges in the channel. *Illinois* was held there until the evening of December 7, getting away after a Government dredge boat had released her and redredged the damaged channel. For your information will say the Government tunnel-type boat should not try to operate between here and the mouth of the Red River during the low-water season. The Barrett Line had a similar experience below Cairo.

EDWARD F. GOLTRA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who just preceded me, has made a vicious attack upon the Mississippi barge line and its manager, General Ashburn. He charges mismanagement and loss of money to the Government, and he has held up before you one Edward F. Goltra as a model barge-line operator, and undertakes to make an unfavorable comparison of the Mississippi barge-line service with Mr. Goltra's operations.

I was fooled at one time by Mr. Goltra just as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is now being deceived. Goltra is a man of fluent speech and of vivid imagination. I thought he was a real friend to waterways. I trusted him as one who had an earnest desire to develop the rivers of the Mississippi Valley and thereby make it possible for the farmers, manufacturers, and merchants of that vast inland area to enjoy the blessings of cheap water transportation.

In an effort to eliminate unfair rail rates intended and designed to prevent the development of river navigation, with a view to establishing cooperation and coordination between the rail and water lines of the country, and in order to eliminate the existing unfair division of freight revenue accruing from joint rail and water hauls, thereby making it possible for navigation to develop upon our great inland rivers, the Government is operating a barge line between St. Louis and New Orleans.

Much depends upon this demonstration. If it is successful and the Government accomplishes the elimination of a network of obstructions set up by the rail lines during the past 50 years and we proceed to complete the projects heretofore adopted upon our rivers, thereby securing permanent and dependable channels, then the navigation of our inland rivers with cheap transportation will become an accomplished fact, and every citizen who has at heart the welfare of the people of the Mississippi Valley is interested in the success of this operation.

It has been a source of painful disappointment to me to learn that during the past year Mr. Goltra has devoted much of his

time to appearing before committees, to calling upon Members of Congress and upon high officials of the Government in an effort to discredit and to destroy this Government operation. In other words, he is deliberately trying to defeat the only instrumentality which the people have to create the conditions which will make successful private navigation of our rivers by common carriers possible.

The Government has constructed barges, towboats, terminals, and other facilities for this barge line valued at approximately \$10,000,000. In order to eliminate red tape and give the operation a fair chance for success, Congress has created a corporation and has given it all the powers of a private transportation agency. We have authorized an appropriation of \$5,000,000 with which to buy such additional equipment as may be found necessary. If we succeed in this undertaking, when the channels are improved the Government will realize a profitable return upon its investment and the commerce of the valley will gain the blessings of facilities for cheap transportation.

If Mr. Goltra succeeds in carrying out his threats to discredit and destroy the barge line, then this investment will be lost to the Government, and successful navigation of our inland rivers may be delayed for a quarter of a century. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], inspired by Mr. Goltra, is attempting to strike out of this bill an item of \$3,000,000 authorized by the last Congress and intended to be used in the purchase of additional equipment necessary in this operation.

Congress, after due consideration, has authorized the Secretary of War to appoint a board of advisors in order that this operation may have the benefit of the judgment and experience of successful business men. The Secretary of War has appointed a board consisting of men whose character, integrity, and business ability can not be questioned. This board, after a thorough investigation, has recommended to the Secretary of War that this item of \$3,000,000 be made available.

The Secretary of War, after a careful investigation of their report, has approved it. The Bureau of the Budget, while carrying on a campaign of rigid economy seldom equaled by any department of the Government, has approved of the appropriation of this item. The President of the United States has transmitted the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to Congress with his approval. The Committee on Appropriations of this House, after a most thorough and exhaustive investigation extending from the beginning of the barge line service to the present time, has reported the item to the House with a recommendation that it do pass, and it remains for Mr. Goltra, actuated by selfish and revengeful motives, through his friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], to attempt to prevent the appropriation of this essential and necessary fund.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] charges that this barge line operation has resulted in a loss to the Government of over \$8,000,000. I challenge the accuracy of that statement. I will concede, however, that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] succeeds in preventing the passage of this item, thereby depriving this operation of essential equipment, and if Mr. Goltra can succeed in preventing the success of this barge-line operation, then the Government will stand to lose a property which has been appraised by the American Appraisal Co., of Milwaukee, as having a value of approximately \$10,000,000.

You may be interested to know the history which leads to the hostility of Mr. Goltra. On May 28, 1919, Mr. Goltra procured a contract from the War Department in which he leased 19 barges and 4 towboats, then under construction by the Government, and designed and intended for operation upon that portion of the Mississippi between St. Louis and Minneapolis.

Section 2 of the contract provides—

That the said lessee shall operate as a common carrier the said fleet of 4 towboats and 19 barges upon the Mississippi River and its tributaries for the period of the lease (five years) and of any renewals thereof, transporting iron ore, coal, and other commodities at rates not in excess of the prevailing rail tariffs—

And the contract provided that its term should begin to run upon the delivery of the first barge or towboat.

Section 2 of the lease further provides—

That the lessee shall pay all operating expenses of the fleet and maintain, during the continuance of the lease, each towboat and barge of the fleet in good operating condition to the satisfaction of the lessor.

Section 3 of the lease provides that—

The net earnings above operating expenses and maintenance for each and every ton of cargo moved and all other net earnings shall be turned over by the lessee to the Secretary of War as soon as practicable after each proper determination of the amount thereof, but at least every 90 days, for deposit with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the Secretary of War.

Section 5 of the lease provides that—

within three months prior to the expiration of the lease, or of any period of renewal, or sooner if so desired by the lessee, a board of three persons shall be appointed to appraise the value of the said fleet at that time, and the said lessee shall be given the option of purchasing the fleet upon the following terms: If the funds turned over to the Secretary of War and deposited by him with the Treasurer of the United States shall aggregate the sum equal to the full appraised value of the boats, then the boats shall belong to the said lessee Goltra. If the funds turned over to the Secretary of War shall be less than the appraised value, then in that event such funds shall be applied to the appraised value of the fleet so far as they shall reach, and the balance shall be paid in 15 annual installments.

Section 8 of the contract provides that—

the lessor reserves the right to inspect the plant, fleet, and work at any time to see that all the said terms and conditions of the lease are fulfilled, and noncompliance, in his judgment, with any of the terms or conditions will justify his terminating the lease and returning the plant and the said barges and towboats to the lessor.

As a lawyer I would say that this is the most phenomenal one-sided contract that I have ever examined. It binds the Government to construct a fleet consisting of 19 steel barges and 4 steel towboats, at a cost to the Government of \$3,864,000, which was paid for out of the Treasury of the United States.

It permits the lessee, Mr. Goltra, to take over and operate said barges and towboats for a period of five years, but binds him to pay nothing to the Government during such period unless he earns same as a profit over and above his total operating expenses, and at the end of the contract period, or at such time as Mr. Goltra may elect, the fleet is to be appraised by disinterested appraisers, the Government is to lose all of the depreciation resulting from the wear and tear upon such fleet, and all of the profits earned by Mr. Goltra must be applied by the Government upon the appraised value of such fleet to the credit and for the benefit of Mr. Goltra. In other words, the Government stands all the depreciation and Mr. Goltra is permitted to use all the profits which he may earn to pay toward the depreciated value of such fleet.

Substantially the only thing which the contract requires of Mr. Goltra is that he should operate the fleet as a common carrier and that he shall maintain the barges and towboats in good operating condition, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War.

Having called your attention to the provisions of the contract, I now desire to narrate to you the conduct of Mr. Goltra operating under its terms. The barges were completed in September, 1921, and the towboats were completed in January, 1922, whereupon the Secretary of War called upon Mr. Goltra to receive the fleet and to operate it as a common carrier according to the provisions of his contract.

Up to this time I had implicit faith in the good intentions of Mr. Goltra, but when the Secretary of War notified him that the fleet was finished and ready for operation Mr. Goltra procrastinated and delayed, making one excuse after another, until July 1, 1922, when Mr. Goltra having failed to take over the fleet, though he had been repeatedly urged to do so by representatives of the War Department, continued to persist in his delay. Thus for six months there was tied up to the banks of the Mississippi River the most practical, modern, up-to-date fleet of barges and towboats ever constructed for use upon that river, while great quantities of grain and other commerce was waiting to be transported to the market and could not be moved because the Government barge line then in operation did not have sufficient equipment with which to carry such commerce.

Many protests and appeals in great numbers came to me from shippers in St. Louis and throughout the valley, because this fleet was not in operation.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. At what rate did the Secretary of War tell him that he could operate?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The Secretary of War told him to operate under the terms of his contract.

Mr. RAINEY. It was not to exceed the rail rate?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. No.

Mr. RAINEY. And the Secretary told him that he could not operate at a lower rate than the rail rate.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. RAINEY. How could he operate these barges in opposition to the Government barges which were permitted by the Secretary to operate at 20 per cent less than the rail rates when he was compelled to operate at the rail rates?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The Goltra boats were designed to carry coal, ore, and other bulk commodities which would not suffer by exposure to the weather, but Mr. Goltra represented to the Secretary of War that he had entered into contracts to carry other commodities such as lumber, oil, asphalt, both liquid and in drums, and many other heavy commodities, whereupon the Secretary of War authorized him to carry all of these commodities at 80 per cent of the rail rate which paralleled the river. The Secretary of War continued this liberal attitude toward Mr. Goltra until he, by threats and statements, made it clear that it was his intention to antagonize and, if possible, defeat the successful operation of the Government barge line which was being operated in the interest of the people, whereupon the Secretary of War refused to permit Mr. Goltra to use one fleet paid for and owned by the Government in competition with and for the purpose of destroying the successful operation of another fleet owned and operated by the Government.

Again referring to my narration of the history of Mr. Goltra's performance of his part of the contract, on July 1, 1922, I went to the Secretary of War and demanded to know why Goltra had not taken over the fleet and placed same in operation, as his contract required, and I told the Secretary of War that the shippers along the Mississippi were complaining because commerce was needing facilities for transportation, and that the Government would never be able to explain to the people of this country why this wonderful fleet, costing the taxpayers nearly \$4,000,000, should be permitted to remain idle, tied to the banks of the Mississippi River, and not in operation. Whereupon the Secretary of War notified Mr. Goltra that unless he received such boats, in accordance with the terms of his contract, on or before 5 p. m. on July 15, 1922, he, the Secretary of War, would revoke such contract under authority vested in him thereunder.

When this ultimatum was issued Mr. Goltra took possession of such fleet, but he did not place it in operation as a common carrier, as required by the terms of the contract, but undertook to camouflage by taking one towboat and four barges and proceeding from St. Louis to Sturgis, Ky., where he purchased two barge loads of coal from the West Kentucky Coal Co. and proceeded down the Ohio River, peddling such coal to consumers wherever he could find them. The other two barges he left tied to the docks of the coal company.

This occurred in the fall of 1922. These two barges are still tied to the docks of this coal company, rusting and depreciating in value, held by the coal company for wharfage and dock charges, while Mr. Goltra, this marvelous and successful barge-line operator described by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], has not to this day paid for the coal which he purchased more than two years ago. As proof of this assertion I will read a telegram received this morning by James E. Smith, that unselfish, faithful, untiring waterway advocate, from C. F. Richardson, president of the West Kentucky Coal Co., at Sturgis, Ky. The telegram reads as follows:

Goltra coal bill unpaid. Two barges in our possession being held for holding charges.

Thus it will be observed that this barge-line operator, who stands as the ideal of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], has a marvelous record for business integrity.

After this camouflaged coal operation the War Department, in an effort to assist Mr. Goltra, tendered him a contract to carry a large amount of cement from Hannibal, Mo., to Cincinnati, Ohio, for use in the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River. Mr. Goltra accepted this contract, and toward its performance actually transported one or perhaps two barge loads of cement from Hannibal to St. Louis, after which Mr. Goltra tied up the entire fleet at or near St. Louis, with the exception of the two barges which he had left at Sturgis, Ky.

The War Department repeatedly appealed to Mr. Goltra to proceed with the operation of his fleet as a common carrier, as his contract required. Mr. Goltra made one excuse after another. In the meantime General Ashburn, chief of the Inland Coastwise Waterways Service, with the approval of the Secretary of War, offered to lease from Mr. Goltra one towboat and four barges of this fleet owned by the Government, paying him therefor an annual rental of \$75,000, with the assurance that if

the demand for transportation, then acute, continued to increase he would lease the entire fleet and pay Mr. Goltra therefor at the same rate, which would amount to an annual rental of \$300,000.

This offer Mr. Goltra absolutely and unqualifiedly refused to accept, but persisted in keeping said fleet tied up in idleness. In other words, this marvelous and successful barge-line operator, described and lauded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], after his utter failure for 14 months to operate such fleet as a common carrier, as required by the terms of his contract, refused to accept from the Government an offer of \$300,000 a year rental upon a fleet constructed, owned, and paid for by the Government, but preferred to take advantage of the one-sided contract which he had procured to hold such fleet in idleness, thus preventing the Government from getting any return upon its investment or the people whose money paid for the fleet from getting any benefit from its operation.

The War Department was moved to make this offer because of the pressing public demand for transportation facilities, because the fleet then in operation by the Government drew too much water to operate at the low-water season between St. Louis and Cairo, as the Goltra fleet was constructed to do, and because the War Department was convinced that it could operate such boats in the Government fleet, pay such rental to Goltra, and in addition to earning a fair return to the Government could establish continuous and dependable operation between St. Louis and New Orleans.

After Mr. Goltra had utterly failed for 14 months to comply with the specific terms of his contract to operate such fleet as a common carrier when repeated demands had been made by the Secretary of War, after his refusal to rent the equipment to the Government upon terms which would have yielded a large income to him upon a fleet in which he had not invested one cent, and at a time when the fleet, because of neglect, lack of paint, and abuse, was found to be in a greatly depreciated condition, the Secretary of War, in an effort to protect the property and rights of the Government, acting upon the advice of the Judge Advocate General and of the Attorney General of the United States, terminated such contract and sent his representative to St. Louis "to return the plant and said barges and towboats to the lessor," as required by section 8 of said contract.

A representative of the War Department, as an agent of the United States, proceeded to St. Louis to take charge of said fleet, as required by the terms of the contract, and to turn same over to the party of the first part to be operated as a common carrier, to constitute a part of the fleet already in operation upon the Mississippi between St. Louis and New Orleans. Whereupon Mr. Goltra succeeded in procuring from the Federal court at St. Louis an order preventing this agent of the Government from delivering to the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service, the duly authorized operating agency of the Government, this fleet which was so much needed by that service. Thus, after Goltra had violated all the terms of his contract, the Government was prevented from operating equipment which it had constructed and which had been paid for out of the Treasury of the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States, however, on or about the 1st of June, 1923, granted permission to the Government to apply for a writ of prohibition with an order permitting the War Department to take over and operate such fleet pending the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon such writ. Under this order the War Department operated such fleet successfully in conjunction with the equipment already in operation for approximately one year, carrying great quantities of commerce at a cheap rate, and earning a good return to the Government.

On or about June 1, 1924, the Supreme Court, having ruled that it had no jurisdiction to issue such writ, the Federal court in St. Louis issued an order requiring the Government to return the fleet to the custody of that court, and soon thereafter the fleet, by order of the court, was restored to Mr. Goltra, whereupon again he proceeded to procrastinate, permitting such fleet to remain in idleness until September, at which time the court ordered him to put such fleet in operation within 30 days upon the pain and penalty of having such fleet restored to the Government in the event of his failure so to do.

Under this order of the court Mr. Goltra has been operating a portion of the fleet as a private carrier, transporting grain for one grain company in Kansas City, but refusing to accept grain from dealers in St. Louis and other places. Thus it will be observed that though approximately four months have elapsed since he received the possession of this fleet, by order of the court, he has not yet attempted or undertaken to comply with

the provisions of his contract by operating same as a common carrier.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has made the extravagant charge that the Government has sustained a loss of more than \$8,000,000 because of the mismanagement of its barge line.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am not sure how clear the gentleman's mind may be as to some of the financial features of the business, but I would like to ask the gentleman several questions.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I would be pleased to have the gentleman from Massachusetts do so, because as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which drafted the bill for the incorporation of the Inland Waterways Corporation, I am persuaded that he may have better information upon the financial features of this line than I have.

Mr. WINSLOW. According to your recollection, did the barge line have a debt of a miscellaneous character of about \$850,000?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; and at that time the barge line was terribly handicapped by the red-tape methods of Government operation which the bill incorporating the service dispensed with.

Mr. WINSLOW. Do you know whether or not at the present time the barge company has any floating indebtedness or any other indebtedness except the indebtedness on borrowed money?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. It has no outstanding indebtedness not covered by liquid assets except \$650,000 borrowed from the bank, and it has in cash approximately \$100,000, so that the outstanding indebtedness of this corporation has been reduced from \$840,000 on the 3d of June, 1924, to \$550,000 on the 1st of January, 1925.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] charges that the Government barge line through mismanagement has lost more than \$8,000,000, and that it has never at any time yielded a profit to the Government. As a matter of fact the Mississippi barge line has demonstrated beyond question the feasibility, the practicability, and the cheap resulting transportation of the navigation of our inland rivers.

The stretch of the river from St. Louis to Cairo has not been improved; the project was adopted in 1910 to be completed within a period of 12 years at a cost of \$21,000,000. Fourteen years have elapsed since its adoption, and instead of completing the improvement by expending the amount necessary we have expended less than \$2,000,000 upon the improvement of this section, and as a result during the low-water season it is impossible to operate barges and towboats of greater draft than 6 feet over this section continuously and successfully.

I beg leave, however, to call to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] the fact that the Mississippi barge line from January to June, during the high-water period of each year, when they could pass over the sandbars, have operated this line at a profit. For instance, from January to July, 1922, the barge line carried 370,909 tons of freight at a profit over and above all operating expenses of \$160,072.

Mr. MADDEN. And they could make it for nine months on high water.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes, and they would do the same thing for 12 months out of the year if the project were completed so that they could have a channel. From January to October, 1924, the barge line carried 698,067 tons of freight at a profit over and above all operating expenses of \$254,561, and the barge line could carry freight at a profit during the entire year if we would complete the channel in order that its towboats could make the trip without going aground.

It is interesting to note, furthermore, that these profits have been earned under the most unfavorable circumstances, during a time when the Government did not have adequate equipment, when its terminals were not sufficient, and yet it earned these profits carrying freight at 3½ mills per ton-mile, while the average rail rate of the country, as shown by the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was 10.78 mills per ton-mile. If we are anxious to help the whole people of the country, what can we do which would be of more benefit to them than to give them a water rate which is less than one-third of the best rate which the railroads can afford to make? And this benefit is not limited to the people who live along the river, but extends through joint rail and water rates to the inhabitants of 36 of the States of this Union, and 165 railroads carry to and from the barge line commodities distributed over all these States.

As stated before, the barge line has been operating successfully at all times when it had a channel, and yet it has labored under many difficulties. For illustration, the rail rate which parallels the river is only 58 per cent of the average rail rate of the country, so established in order to discourage the development of water transportation. Furthermore, the division of revenue accruing from a joint rail and water haul is almost intolerable. For illustration, in the shipment of 100 pounds of coffee from New Orleans to Davenport, Iowa, the railroad carries this freight 400 miles and takes 38.3 cents of the revenue, while the barge line carries the same freight 973 miles and gets 11.7 cents for its service.

In transporting 100 pounds of sugar from New Orleans to Jonesboro, Ark., the railroad carries the freight 143 miles and gets 34.2 cents; the barge line hauls it 746 miles and gets 11.8 cents. In transporting 100 pounds of sugar from Loisel, La., to Kansas City the railroad carries the freight 477 miles and gets 56.9 cents; the barge line carries it 1,154 miles and gets 1.9 cents for its service.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman is speaking of continuous shipments, as I understand.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Where the barge line carries it a part of the way and the railroad another part of the way?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

In hauling 100 pounds of sugar from Juniata to Belle Plaine, Iowa, the railroad carries the freight 565 miles and gets 63.6 cents; the barge line carries it 1,154 miles and gets 9.1 cents.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The board of managers which has been appointed under the authorization to organize a corporation has been getting decisions from the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect to cooperation between water and rail transportation which will, in the long run, establish precedents, and which will establish definitely and for all time the possibility of water transportation.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Absolutely. This Government barge line operation was made necessary by a network of obstructions built up by the railroads during the past half century in an effort to destroy river navigation and prevent its return by making it impossible for it to earn a living by such operation. These obstructions have been so effectively established that private operations have been unable to resist them.

For instance, the first case filed by the Government barge line before the Interstate Commerce Commission was an application to have the commission lay down a just basis for division of revenue accruing from joint rail and water hauls. It required from October, 1920, to April, 1923, to get a decision from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and when this decision was rendered it was practically to this effect: "We think the principles laid down by the barge line are correct, but their application is so broad that it would be impracticable for this commission to lay down rules which would cover all the varying cases which would arise under this application. The barge line is, however, at liberty and deserves to treat separately with each individual railroad with which it deals regarding the division of the joint revenue, and if in any particular case it can not come to a fair decision that case may be individually laid before the commission and individually passed upon."

No private operator could have hoped to deal individually with the railroads, endure this cut-throat competition and unfair division of revenue, and survive all the delays which the railroads are able to place in their way. Bankruptcy would have been the inevitable result. The only agency which can deal with such a situation, which can survive this terrible antagonism, which has the power to resist and ultimately brush away these obstructions and make possible the development, establishment, and assurance for the future of cheap water transportation for the people of this country, is the Government of the United States.

It was with this aim in view that Congress appropriated the money with which to build up this governmental agency. It was with this purpose in view that the Inland Waterways Corporation was established in order that the people of the country might have some agency to fight their battles in the interest of justice, and as soon as this agency has performed the service for which it was intended by the abolishment of cut-throat competition by the establishment of a system which requires a fair division of the revenue collected between joint rail and water carriers, and as soon as Congress supplies the funds with which to complete these waterway projects so that private barge lines can operate and move, then Government operation will have fulfilled its mission and the people will be

secure in the future in the enjoyment of the cheap rates which water transportation alone can afford to give.

Mr. Goltra and his friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY], while pretending faith in river transportation and their desire to see it established, are attempting to defeat an appropriation which is necessary to supply equipment sorely needed by the barge line. The equipment now operated by the barge line is of too deep a draft to operate at low-water periods over the unimproved stretches of the Mississippi, and the barges upon the Warrior section, built of wood, have decayed to such an extent that they can not be profitably operated or even kept afloat.

If Mr. Goltra, instead of holding this modern fleet out of operation for substantially two years, had permitted it to be taken into the service of the barge line, these light-draft towboats and barges could have operated at low-water seasons between St. Louis and Cairo and the profits derived therefrom would have been sufficient to have built an entire new steel fleet upon the Warrior River, and the Government barge line could have been operating successfully all of the year, and if this fleet had been turned over to the Government, as it should have been after Mr. Goltra violated his contract, then this appropriation of \$3,000,000 would not be necessary, and there is nobody to blame for the item being necessary except Mr. Goltra, who has held a fleet valued at \$4,000,000 belonging to the Government tied up for nearly two years, and Mr. Goltra, while being held up by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] as a barge-line operator of such marvelous achievements, has never up to this good hour paid 1 cent into the Treasury of the United States toward the cost of that fleet. In my humble judgment he has done more to injure the cause of river navigation than all other forces combined. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have 10 minutes remaining. I yield that time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House. I am going to ask you to consider for a few minutes a bill which I have introduced to-day, which perhaps some of you may regard as presumptuous on the part of a new Member.

On October 17, 1924, Secretary Hughes, in the course of an address delivered at Albany, N. Y., made the following statement:

It ought to be possible for Cabinet officers to take part in the debates in both Houses on matters touching their departments and thus be able to give exact information and to defend themselves against unjust attacks. A vast amount of time is now wasted in the Congress over the things that are not and never were. An ounce of fact is worth many pounds of talk. Under the present arrangements, a Cabinet officer often hears of misunderstandings and of an outpouring of mistaken notions, which a brief statement from him could have corrected, but the misapprehension has been voiced, and has gone through the country perhaps never to be overtaken.

This desirable change could be made at any time under appropriate rules which would promote the convenience both of Cabinet officers and the Houses of Congress. It could be required that questions to be addressed to the members of the Cabinet should be filed a certain length of time before the appearance of the officer and except when matters relating to his department were under discussion his attendance would be excused. It would not be difficult to arrange the mechanism of such contact if its importance were recognized.

Secretary Hughes in this very able address recommends that members of the Cabinet be permitted to participate in the debates and be questioned by Members of the House.

The bill which I have introduced to-day seeks to accomplish that purpose and is as follows:

A bill to provide for the attendance of the officers of the several executive departments and independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices during the sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives

Be it enacted, etc., That on request of either the Senate or the House of Representatives, by resolution, and in the event they are accorded the same rights and privileges in debate as are accorded Members of the respective Houses, it shall be the duty of the officers of the several executive departments and independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices to attend the sessions of either House or their respective Committees of the Whole, and if not incompatible with the public interest answer such inquiries as may be propounded germane to the subject matter of the proposed legislation then pending in such House.

SEC. 2. That under such rules as the Senate and House of Representatives may prescribe the heads of the several executive departments and independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices may attend the sessions of such Houses and participate in debate on proposed legislation relating to their respective departments and independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices.

The first section of my bill would make it compulsory for members of the Cabinet to appear in person in Congress when requested to do so by resolution of either the House or the Senate to answer questions regarding pending legislation. The second section confers a privilege upon Cabinet officers enabling them to appear in Congress voluntarily and to participate in debates if they so desire. In no event, however, would such executive heads have the right to vote or to initiate legislation.

The purpose of the bill which I have introduced is to effect a more harmonious cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, to the end that more intelligent legislation may be secured, and to the end also that what is now done in a secret manner and in a way not intended by the framers of our Constitution may be done publicly, aboveboard, and in this way stimulate a keener general interest throughout the country in public affairs.

I know some of you will say this is a rather drastic change in our method of doing business. I have only a few minutes and can not cover the entire ground, but let me call your attention to some very striking things which have occurred in our own history with respect to this very procedure suggested in my bill. The framers of our Constitution, I believe, had in mind that Cabinet officers should appear personally in the House and the Senate. For instance, when the Treasury Department was created by statute September 2, 1789, section 2 of that law required the Secretary of the Treasury "to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue" and "to make report and give information to either branch of the Legislature, in person or in writing—as he may be required—respecting all matters referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives." Acting under the authority of the law, Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, offered to appear in person to make his report and present his views on the public credit act. The Congress preferred in this instance to receive his report in writing. No question was raised, however, as to the legality or regularity of the Secretary's request to be permitted to appear in person.

President Washington appeared several times in person in the Senate to sponsor the adoption of an Indian treaty which he was interested in having accepted by the Senate. Thomas Jefferson, in his official capacity as Secretary of Foreign Affairs, appeared in person in the Senate to argue some legislative project. General Knox, Secretary of the War Department, likewise appeared in person in the Senate on several occasions.

The point I desire to make now is that the framers of the Constitution actually had in mind that executive officers created by Congress—and members of the Cabinet are created by Congress—are agents of Congress and can be made to appear here and ought to be given the opportunity to appear whenever they so choose. The founders not only had it in mind but acted in accordance with this theory, as shown by the above illustrations.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes; gladly.

Mr. CABLE. Is it not a fact that it is customary to invite Cabinet members before committees and is it not also customary for the President to submit bills to Cabinet members for their opinions before he signs them or vetoes them?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes. I understand the present procedure brings Cabinet officers, or any other official, before committees of the House in connection with committee hearings. The President also appears in Congress personally at times to convey his message to the House and to the country. But the purpose of the bill I have introduced is to bring executive heads of the Government not merely before committees but before the House and the Senate. It is true that those executive agents operate under the President, but they are created by Congress. It is my desire to bring them here in order that we may argue face to face questions of tax reduction, Muscle Shoals, the Postal Service, or any other matter of great moment.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. We have three distinct departments of Government, the executive, legislative, and judicial. Would not the gentleman's bill mark a radical departure from our

scheme of Government and permit the executive department to inject itself into the legislative department, thereby—through a system of coercion or duress—influencing and controlling legislation?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will answer that question in this way:

I understand your question to be, Will there not be intimidation by the presence of Cabinet officers on the floor of the House? I would rather have that kind of intimidation, where I know what a man has got to say and where he has to answer my questions, than to have that sort of intimidation which comes through White House breakfasts.

Mr. LOZIER. Would not this bill destroy the difference between the executive and legislative departments completely?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No; I do not think so. I think what it means is that the legislation which would be enacted would be enacted more intelligently by virtue of the fact that we would be getting advice and information from the men who are expected to be informed concerning their respective departments.

Mr. LOZIER. One more question. Would there not be the same reason why this Congress should have representation in the Cabinet or in the executive branch of the Government as that the executive branch of the Government should have representation here and permission to participate in debates on the floor of the House?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. There is this difference: The President, under the Constitution, is our Chief Executive. He is responsible for the administration of the law, with the agents which we give him to carry out that law. We, the Congress, however, have the right—and that constitutional right has never been questioned, so far as I am aware—to invite into our deliberations members of the executive branch of the Government and compel their attendance if necessary. The President, however, might properly object to our participation in his Cabinet meetings.

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. MONTAGUE rose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas and then yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLANTON. I will give way to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just a question on the constitutional phase. Does the gentleman recall that two very eminent committees, one of this House and one of the Senate, reported upon the matter some years ago and that they reported unanimously that there could be no possible constitutional objection on the ground of the separation of the powers of government?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is so, and I am glad the gentleman has reminded me of that fact. I have before me the report referred to, signed by eminent statesmen of that day, 1881. This report is known as the Pendleton report, the signers being George H. Pendleton, W. B. Allison, D. W. Voorhees, J. G. Blaine, M. C. Butler, John J. Ingalls, O. H. Platt, and J. T. Farley. It was a unanimous report, as I recall it. They recommended favorably a bill similar to the one I have introduced, and I understand the gentleman from Virginia, Governor MONTAGUE, has also introduced a bill similar to the one I have introduced.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have introduced the identical bill recommended by those gentlemen in every Congress for the past 13 years.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am glad to learn that a similar bill has been introduced and indorsed so frequently by the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield to me?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has been here long enough to know that the present practice goes beyond these breakfasts at the White House. Whenever one of the departments of the Government wants a bill passed they prepare it and send it to us. But they do not stop there, because when the bill is under consideration you will find them in the cloakrooms, in the gallery, out in the hall, and in the alcoves in the lobby.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Would it not be better to have them here?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think they ought to attend to their business and let us attend to ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I should like to quote some significant passages from the Pendleton report referred to above, which on February 4, 1881, reported favorably and unanimously a bill similar to the one which I have introduced. It is stated in the report that—

The committee entertains no doubt of the constitutional power to pass this bill. It believes all its provisions to be clearly within the letter and spirit of the Constitution and in entire harmony with the structure and framework of the Government. * * *

We are dealing with no new question. In the early history of the Government the communications were made by the President to Congress orally, and in the presence of both or either of the Houses. Instances are not wanting—nay, they are numerous—where the President of the United States, accompanied by one or more of his Cabinet, attended the sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives in their separate sessions and laid before them papers which had been required and information which had been asked for.

Your committee is not unmindful of the maxim that in a constitutional government the great powers are divided into legislative, executive, and judicial, and that they should be conferred upon distinct departments. These departments should be defined and maintained, and it is a sufficiently accurate expression to say that they should be independent of each other. But this independence in no just or practical sense means an entire separation, either in their organization or their functions—isolation—either in the scope or the exercise of their powers. Such independence or isolation would produce either conflict or paralysis, either inevitable collision or inaction, and either the one or the other would be in derogation of the efficiency of the Government. Such independence of coequal and coordinate departments has never existed in any civilized government, and never can exist.

If there is anything perfectly plain in the Constitution and organization of the Government of the United States, it is that the great departments were not intended to be independent and isolated in the strict meaning of these terms; but that, although having a separate existence, they were to cooperate, each with the other, as the different members of the human body must cooperate with each other in order to form the figure and perform the duties of a perfect man.

It has been objected that the effect of this introduction of the heads of departments upon the floor would be largely to increase the influence of the Executive on legislation. Your committee does not share this apprehension. The information given to Congress would doubtless be more pertinent and exact; the recommendations would, perhaps, be presented with greater effect; but, on the other hand, the Members of Congress would also be put on the alert to see that the influence is in proportion only to the value of the information and the suggestions, and the public would be enabled to determine whether the influence is exerted by persuasion or by argument. No one who has occupied a seat on the floor of either House; no one of those who, year after year, so industriously and faithfully and correctly report the proceedings of the Houses; no frequenter of the lobby or the gallery, can have failed to discern the influence exerted upon legislation by the visits of the heads of departments to the floors of Congress and the visits of the Members of Congress to the offices in the departments. It is not necessary to say that the influence is dishonest or corrupt, but it is illegitimate; it is exercised in secret by means that are not public, by means which an honest public opinion can not accurately discover and over which it can therefore exercise no just control. The open information and argument provided by the bill may not supplant these secret methods, but they will enable a discriminating public judgment to determine whether they are sufficient to exercise the influence which is actually exerted, and thus disarm them.

This system will require the selection of the strongest men to be heads of departments, and will require them to be well equipped with the knowledge of their offices. It will also require the strongest men to be the leaders of Congress and participate in debate. It will bring these strong men in contact, perhaps into conflict, to advance the public weal, and thus stimulate their abilities and their efforts and will thus assuredly result to the good of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. I thought it might be well, gentlemen, before proceeding further with our labors on this bill, to recall the fact that six years ago this morning there passed away an ex-President of the United States.

On the 6th day of January, 1919, a mighty figure fell. The Nation's foremost citizen was taken. One of the pillars of the Republic was overthrown. The column of a great life was broken. The most potent single, individual force for good in our national life was lost, except as the inspiration of his life and deeds continues to actuate a hundred million people.

The very great are plain and simple. On a winter's day, snow-whitened, under the trees of Sagamore Hill, amid the simplest, plainest surroundings and ceremony, all reflecting his rugged, hard-working, straightforward life, Theodore Roosevelt, citizen, was consigned to Mother Earth by his family and his neighbors.

Theodore Roosevelt was a physical, mental, and moral dynamo. He radiated strength, knowledge, and light. He was the most remarkable, original, diversified, and fascinating personality of his generation. He occupied more responsible official positions, requiring more different qualities and abilities than any other man in our history. Assemblyman, Civil Service Commissioner, police commissioner, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, lieutenant colonel, governor, Vice President, President.

He was an essayist, an historian, an editorial writer, a lecturer, a moral philosopher, a ranchman, a naturalist, a hunter, an explorer; he was a soldier, a mediator, a builder; he was a legislator, a lifelong student of national and world affairs, a politician, a statesman.

In all these diversified activities he did not excel as first in any one. There were greater hunters, but few who returned more real trophies of the hunt. There were greater naturalists, archaeologists, and philologists, though few who conveyed more knowledge of this character to the people. There were better orators, though few more forceful speakers. His was a plain, blunt, short, Anglo-Saxon style of speech, put together essay fashion to secure a constant driving force to word and idea. Each word fell with the impact of a hammer blow. There were better writers, though few more interesting, clear, and cogent. There were better soldiers, though few more direct, impetuous, and inspiring. There were greater statesmen, according to certain standards, though none more practical and efficient.

But when we sum up all of these qualities and many more, they present a grand average, which compares as a vast mountain range to a few single peaks, or the innumerable small hills and plateaus below. He raised many common, average abilities by determination, by ambition, by perseverance, by tenacity, by unremitting work, by the development of use to the nth power; coordinated and virilized them until he became the most marvelously efficient piece of human individual machinery our Nation has produced.

He came from a mixture of nationalities. In him ran the blood of the Scotch, the Irish, the Hollander, the Huguenot, the Cavalier, and the Puritan. The racial characteristics of numerous peoples were his, but so mingled, blended, merged, fused, and vitalized as to make a man of a distinct race. They were crystallized into a clear, white shining Americanism.

He understood the whole American people as no other American since Lincoln. He understood them because he knew the South, his mother's home was there; because he knew the North, he was a northerner; because he knew the East, being born and reared there; because he knew the West, having from choice and desire lived there for a time and studied its people and their needs. A man of the highest ideals, yet intensely practical, his judgment upon any question was the average judgment of the average American. Hence he has been more uniformly right upon questions affecting the American national life than any man in public life in the last 25 years. It was no accident that he was elected to the presidency by the unprecedented plurality of 2,000,000; a 100 per cent greater plurality than was given his predecessor or his successor of the same political faith.

His statesmanship was common sense raised to its highest power; plain judgment exalted and applied to questions of the most tremendous importance, involving the welfare of our country and the world. His habits of practical conclusions were not shaken or strained by their application to the problems of statesmanship. His feet were rested firmly on the ground, and though a colossus, his head was not lost in the clouds. His vision remained clear. He worked close to the earth among its people and their trials, helping to solve the

problems of the daily life of the man, the woman, the child; questions of the home, of education, of character. He preached the doctrine of common honesty, common sense, and courage. Yet, though thus engaged with mankind in walking the earth and meeting its obstacles, he could stand erect, lift his head and see afar off the great events shaping our national life and destiny.

He was a believer and practitioner of the American doctrine of the equality of men. I have sat at table at a ranch cook-house and heard him relate to ranchmen, cowboys, and ranch hands stories of his travels, his meeting with Emperors and Kings; he was a man, talking to other men.

He said:

I tell you, boys, after being abroad, American equality is a real thing.

Later he described his visits into the homes of the coal miners of Pennsylvania and how he sat with the family and invited their confidences that he might have first-hand knowledge of their daily lives. Verily he could and did, as Kipling puts it:

Walk with kings nor lose the common touch.

Theodore Roosevelt was, as he was called, the most typical American of his age, because he exemplified in his own character to the greatest degree the three great characteristics or elements that have made this Nation great, and which, if perpetuated, will perpetuate the Nation—culture, strength, and love of liberty. He had the highest culture of the educated East, with its conservatism; he had the strength of the great agricultural center, with its progressivism; he had the love of liberty of the mountainous West, with its intensity. "Montani semper liberi." "Mountaineers are always free-men." He knew each of these sections, and they knew him; he partook of the quality of each. Each of these sections are infused also with the main characteristic of the other sections, so that all will live and endure as one—the United States of America. So at one time Roosevelt would reflect and emphasize the culture of the East; again the love of liberty of the West; again the strength of the central valley. But whichever was accentuated we knew the other essentials were there, and thus combined he was at all times one—the American.

No wonder that he has been described both before and after his death by the following expressions from the leading statesmen and editors of our country: "Known and admired as standing for all that is most forceful, compelling and at the same time fascinating, in the American character." "Greatest American of his day." "The most typical American." "The most representative American." "The composite American of his day." "The embodiment of our Nation." "His intense Americanism," states a prominent editor, "was the great, guiding, moving, pulsating, overwhelming principle of his life." Another great editor has said:

His restless energy, his keen zest of living, his courage, his audacity, his democratic habits, his ready sympathy for every class, the mixture in him of the practical and the ideal, all these were characteristics of the soil from which he sprang.

The President of the United States said of him:

He awoke the Nation to the dangers of private control which lurked in our financial and industrial systems. It was by thus converting and stimulating the purposes of the country that he opened the way for subsequent necessary and beneficent reforms.

A great daily paper declares:

Mr. Roosevelt literally tore out by the roots the tradition that money getting was the chief end of the American citizen.

Another says:

President Roosevelt's greatest achievement was that he changed the mental attitude of the people and brought big business itself to repentance and to ways of righteousness.

One of New York's great dailies proclaimed at his death:

President Roosevelt laid the foundation of the new order of larger democracy.

The laws placed upon the statutes of the United States during the seven years of his Presidency, the policies begun in his and put into effect under his successors, demonstrate conclusively that his administration was the turning point from the all too untrammelled commercialism, which succeeded the splendid patriotic era immediately subsequent to the Civil War, to the age of social justice and wider and truer democracy; the turning point from an unlimited individualism in business, permitting the strong to use their strength to the injury of the many, to a regulated liberty. A partial list of legislation of the

Roosevelt administration will demonstrate the vital and important character of the reforms.

Roosevelt was a man of destiny for these purposes. These tremendous reformations required in its leader high purpose, common sense, and courage. Above all other men, Roosevelt stood forth as preeminently combining these qualities. He had the ideals necessary to lift himself and whole people. He was always practical and made each gain as it was possible under the circumstances, working with or against friend or foe, supporter or opponent, where a result for betterment could be secured. He did not know the meaning of fear. Idealism, practicality, courage, and the greatest of these was courage.

To break through the iron ring of tradition, custom, inertia; to combat the great financial interests; to rise above party fear, influence, and caution; to tell both capital and labor when they were wrong and fight them without fear or favor, without self-interest or prejudice; to attack ultraconservatism, on the one hand, and resist extreme radicalism, as did President Roosevelt, required a steadfast, invincible courage. Ah, it was the magnificent, sheer, pure courage of this man that drew and held to him as "with hoops of steel" men by the millions—aye, a whole people. Next to his Americanism, this great attribute of pure courage will be most mentioned or thought of wherever and whenever his name is seen or spoken in the years to come.

There came a time when as never before his courageous Americanism was needed by the American people, and he did not fail them. He rang true. He did not follow the people. He either advanced with them or he led them. Leading, he called upon them to rise true to their traditions and come forward.

In 1914 and 1915 the people of our country, disturbed by a European war from their peaceful commercialism, in 1916 bewildered, confused, uncertain as to their position and duty, startled out of their careless, selfish, profit-making view of the Great War by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, began to hearken with returning and increasing attention to a voice which for two years had persistently advocated a clear-cut, clean, American policy. For two years Roosevelt had explained and urged, analyzed and advised—aye, pleaded, for preparedness—for the performance of duty. At a time when no public man saw, or, if seeing, dared speak out, Roosevelt saw and spoke. From the day of the violation of Belgium and The Hague treaty, to which we were a signatory power, he wrote and lectured, pleaded and exhorted. From the day of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, even then holding his burning wrath and white-hot indignation in check by marvelous self-control, in deference to the Government's administration, the necessities of diplomacy, he denounced and warned, expounded and urged, even whipped us with the lash of scorn and contempt, to awaken us to danger and duty.

The intense soul conviction of the man, his deathless fighting courage, lifted the American people up to their higher selves, brought them to a realization that America—the first greatest permanent exponent of self-government—must, not only as a matter of self-preservation, but as a matter of duty, of honor, of obligation to right and humanity, give of its vast riches, give of its tremendous resources, give its power, its manhood and womanhood, brought them to throw the weight of this giant young Republic into the desperate struggle upon the side of the war-worn Allies and deal the deathblow to the insolent powers of absolutism. Ah, but that was the work of a giant! That was the supreme effort of a supreme life! That was the real, final mission of Theodore Roosevelt upon the earth for America and thus for the world.

He sought, under the desire of the people, the resolution of Congress to go in person on the field of battle. This was denied him. Conceive, if you can, the bitterness of his disappointment, with his warrior heart big for action. But he gave four sons to battle; he gave two to wounds and maiming; he gave one to death. Meanwhile, ignoring the canker of his rejection, he went on with the mighty task of inspiring the American people to support the President, support Congress, support the war; to prepare, to economize, sacrifice; give and give and give! The great soul of the people responded—the answer was there all the time; the power, the faith, the capacity to see and know and do their duty; yet it was his voice and pen above all others which roused them to decision and action. His was the voice "crying out in the wilderness" of confusion and uncertainty. He was a veritable firebrand of patriotism, rousing the people from their lethargy. He brought the people to see; and seeing, he knew they would respond. They rose from the dead level of commerce and trade and profit to a living perpendicular of sacrifice and battle. No more inspiring, glorious event does history dis-

close than the final sudden rising, the exaltation, the apotheosis of the American people in the Great War.

Behold this man in the last months of his career, and find, if you can, a finer example of dauntless spirit and pure patriotism. Weakened by operations made necessary by the ravages of the insidious Brazilian fever long in his system, perhaps by the effect of the hidden bullet of a would-be assassin, coming out of the torture chamber of the hospital with half of his vision gone, half of his hearing destroyed, his very powers of locomotion affected, he "carried on" the gallant fight of Americanism for liberty and humanity. Among the forces that dethroned tyranny and enthroned humanity forever history will, I believe, record that the example, the power, the inspiration of one man—Theodore Roosevelt—constituted one of the most transcendent importance.

He lived to hear upon every tongue those two words which will go down in history linked in imperishable glory—"America" and "Chateau-Thierry"—lived to know the day when the American troops took from the foe the ground in which his son lay buried, the grave he was destined never to see. There came the day of final victory. What a reward—what a solace! What a deep, abiding, proud joy must have been his!

His last message was one looking to the immediate future—a warning against the other dangerous extreme—bolshevism; against the Charybdis of anarchy, after having escaped the Scylla of tyranny; against liberty without order after having destroyed order without liberty; against rule from beneath after overturning rule from above. His final word was for a government of the people by a law respecting people; liberty with order; and reminded us that one preventative of anarchy is social justice. We are now face to face with this huge problem throughout the world. America must hold steadfast, proving that she has the balance, the equilibrium, the justice to all classes, inherent in her very Constitution and life necessary to preserve herself, and, by preserving herself, the world. In this great task, we shall be without his service, save the mighty power and inspiration of the memory of his vigorous personality, his clean manhood, his practical wisdom, his moral strength, his stalwart patriotism, his pure Americanism.

I give to you a message which he gave to the people in the very flush and prime and plenitude of his power and official authority; when if ever, a man might forget humility and dependence upon Divine Power:

It is an important thing for the people of this Nation to remember their rights, but it is an even more important thing for them to remember their duties. In the last analysis the work of statesmen and soldiers, the work of the public man, shall go for nothing if it is not based upon the spirit of Christianity working in the millions of homes throughout this country so that there may be that social, that spiritual, that moral foundation, without which no country can ever rise to permanent greatness. For material well-being, material prosperity, success in arts, industrial triumphs, all of them and all of the structures raised thereon will be as evanescent as a dream if it does not rest on "The righteousness that exalteth a nation."

He rests in the Pantheon of America's great. His name is added to the incomparable list of our heroic dead. His work was done, as was Lincoln's, and he was taken. We memorialize the passing of a mighty spirit, a valiant soul, "A man's man, a hero's hero, an American's American."

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the adjutant general of the State of Michigan touching a claim for bonus of an Ohio soldier. This letter seems to call upon me to furnish testimony. I have been a candidate for Congress in the ninth district of Ohio in 11 elections and 9 different candidates have been against me. I have been nine times elected. They are all dead now but three, and I want to say that in no campaign have I ever indulged in any personal matter; never. [Applause.]

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Lansing, December 13, 1924.

Mr. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,

Scottwood Apartments, Toledo, Ohio.

MY DEAR Mr. SHERWOOD: I trust you will pardon the liberty I take in addressing you on a matter which will probably be considered, at least, rather unusual. It appears that some one may be making an effort to cause the State of Michigan to pay a soldiers' bonus claim to which the man is not entitled under the law, and while the depart-

ment does not take kindly to any underhanded move in the obtaining of its evidence, still it is a fact that it is often necessary to fight fire with fire. Therefore I am asking you for certain information.

W. W. CHALMERS, Representative from your district, is making an effort to have the claim of his son, Andrew Chalmers, paid by the State of Michigan on the grounds that he was a resident of this State at the time he entered the service. This claim has been before the department for over two years and the attitude I have taken is that the man never morally established a residence in Michigan, and more important yet, that he may have been directly or indirectly guilty of an effort to evade the selective service regulations. If so, he is not entitled to payment.

I have sent a representative through the territory at Petersburg, Deerfield, and Adrian, and have lately made a personal trip and feel certain from the evidence collected that my claim is right.

Mr. CHALMERS was personally in my office on the 2d and 3d of this month and while here stated among other things that twice when he was running for Congress an effort was made to hurt him politically by the starting of a suit against him and against his son for a \$90 board bill filed by or for one Walter Avrill, who was proprietor of the Exchange Hotel in Petersburg, Mich.

I do not know whether these facts are known to you or not. The only reason I am taking the matter up with you is that Mr. CHALMERS stated that you had been his opponent at both elections, and I surmise that you might be able to tell me where I could get the inside information as to the filing of this suit, and the details which were the basis for it.

My entire interest and desire is to obtain sufficient evidence to prove the contention which the State is making, through me, that the man was guilty of trying to evade the draft. In conversation with Mr. Avrill, who was proprietor of the hotel mentioned, he stated that this information had all been given some one (name forgotten) and that suit had been started.

May I ask that any data in your file bearing on this or any other matters of interest in regard to the family of Mr. CHALMERS which you would feel justified in giving might be forwarded to me. I assure you it is to be used only in case suit is brought against the State of Michigan by Mr. CHALMERS. If my surmise that you could supply this information is not correct, I respectfully request that you give me the name and address of the association or individual who represents the Hotel Men's Association, so the facts can be obtained.

Thanking you, I remain,

Yours very truly,

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF MICHIGAN,
By R. S. DEAN, Chief of Bonus Division.

(Claim 122656)

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Lansing, December 30, 1924.

HON. ISAAC R. SHEERWOOD,
Scottwood Apartments, Toledo, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. SHEERWOOD: I trust you will pardon my asking if it is going to be convenient for you to give the information requested in my letter of December 13 in reference to Andrew B. and W. W. Chalmers. I assure you that it is necessary in order to assist in the adjudication of a claim against the State of Michigan which I am confronted with, which is without a moral basis.

Yours very truly,

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF MICHIGAN,
By R. S. DEAN, Chief of Bonus Division.

The adjutant general of the State of Michigan assumes, because Congressman-elect CHALMERS was my opponent in the election of November 4 last, that I have knowledge of the merits of this disputed claim. My only knowledge is the record of the case of selective-draft evasion on the part of the son of Congressman-elect Chalmers as filed in the court of common pleas of Lucas County, Ohio.

This petition claims that Congressman-elect CHALMERS, after the selective draft was ordered, went over the Michigan-Ohio line and bought a small farm in Monroe County, Mich., and placed his son on the farm and secured his exemption from the selective draft by the draft commissioners of Monroe County on the grounds that his son was a farmer and a farm owner. Later, according to the record, the draft commissioners of Monroe County discovered that young Chalmers was not living on the farm, but was boarding in a hotel at Petersburg, Mich., a small town about 20 miles from Toledo, Ohio.

The draft exemption was then revoked, and to save further trouble the young man enlisted in the Army, but never served overseas. The adjutant general of Michigan has made an investigation by his own agents and intimates in his letter to me that young Chalmers was a draft evader. In a second letter the adjutant general states that the claim for bonus made by Congressman-elect CHALMERS for his son has no moral basis.

The matter is no longer personal but of general concern, but I do not feel called upon as a citizen to furnish evidence or take any part in the controversy. I did not know until I received the letter of the adjutant general of Michigan that Congressman-elect CHALMERS was prosecuting a claim for bonus on account of his son.

As the adjutant general, according to his letter, has already discovered the bogus character of the claim and that it has no moral basis, I do not feel called upon as a disinterested citizen to take any part in the controversy.

During the last campaign I was opposed by the most thorough organization, manned by the most adroit politician in Ohio, Walter F. Brown, late chairman of the reorganization committee of Congress, late candidate for United States Senator, late manager of President Harding's campaign for nomination; a man who during President Harding's term put his legs under the mahogany White House dining table oftener than any citizen either in public or private life in the United States.

He is probably the most adroit and accomplished political organizer and vote buyer in the 48 States. He spent some \$75,000 over and above the legal amount of the corrupt practice act to defeat my reelection to Congress and won the election, although my vote shows that I ran some 33,000 ahead of the Democratic nominee for President and 17,500 ahead of the average Democratic vote for county and State offices. President Coolidge carried the district by some 23,000 votes.

At a time when patriotism is comatose and money and organization control elections, and 40 per cent of the legal voters are too indifferent to vote, an organizer of Mr. Brown's ability and accomplishments is the potent force. Mr. Brown is of most engaging personality. He reminds me of Lord Byron's ode to a leading pirate of the Mediterranean:

He was the mildest mannered man
Who ever scuttled ship or cut a throat
With such true bearing of a gentleman.

I accept the verdict of the election with calm philosophy and with gracious charity for all and no animosities.

It will always be a delightful memory that will abide with me during my short span of life that I enjoyed the society of so many splendid gentlemen on both sides of this historic Chamber for so many years.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE SENATE

Conveying votes of electors for President and Vice President: For the payment of the messengers of the respective States for conveying to the seat of government the votes of the electors of said States for President and Vice President of the United States, at the rate of 25 cents for every mile of the estimated distance by the most usual roads traveled from the place of meeting of the electors to the seat of government of the United States, computed for one distance only, \$14,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. CABLE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: After line 11, on page 2, insert:

"Public Buildings Commission: The General Accounting Office is authorized to credit the accounts of the disbursing officer of the Public Buildings Commission in the amount of \$180 heretofore expended by the commission for the maintenance of a motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicle."

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the gentleman from Ohio desires to offer an amendment to the paragraph as read, and that would have preference.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I withhold my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withhold his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABLE. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABLE: At the direction of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: "On page 2 strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: That section 140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 140. The electors shall dispose of the certificates thus made by them in the following manner: (1) They shall forthwith forward by United States registered mail one of such certificates to the President of the Senate of the United States at the seat of government; (2) the first day thereafter they shall forthwith forward by United States registered mail one of such certificates to the President of the Senate of the United States at the seat of government; (3) they shall forthwith cause the other of the certificates to be delivered to the judge of that district in which the electors shall assemble."

"That section 145 of the United States Statutes be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order, unless the gentleman from Ohio is going to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard upon his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; if it is necessary. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] wishes to show why he has a right to offer this amendment, I will be glad to reserve my statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Was there a specific point of order assigning the grounds of the point of order against the amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. It changes existing law.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not a good point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the additional point of order that it is not germane to the section to which it is offered and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois made the point of order and is entitled to prior recognition.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to argue the point of order.

The law requires the electors of each State to meet, at such place in the State as the legislature of the State has prescribed, on the second Monday in January following their appointment. The second Monday in January will be January 12, 1925.

The electors are required to make and sign three certificates of all of the votes given by them, seal them up, and certify thereon that all the votes of that State for President and Vice President are contained in that package.

The electors are required to dispose of the certificates of electoral votes as follows:

(1) Send one copy forthwith by messenger appointed by them to the President of the Senate. The messengers must arrive and deliver their certificates on or before the fourth Monday in January, which would be January 26, 1925.

(2) Send one copy by mail to the President of the Senate.

(3) Send one copy to the district judge of the district in which the electors meet.

If the certificate from any State has not arrived at the seat of government on the fourth Monday in January the Secretary of State shall send a special messenger to the district judge for the copy filed with him.

The electoral votes are counted the second Wednesday in February, which will be February 11, 1925.

The chronological order of events in connection with the electoral vote are as follows:

January 12, electors meet in their respective States.

Forthwith appoint a messenger to convey the certificate.

January 26, last date for receipt of certificates of votes.

February 11, counting of votes in joint session.

Under the law the messengers conveying the certificates receive 25 cents per mile computed for one distance only.

The amendment proposed is designed to do away with the conveying of the certificates by messengers and substitute therefor transmission by registered mail.

If the amendment is offered by the committee of the House having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the amendment upon the report of that committee it would probably be in order under the Holman rule. Whether the amendment is wise at this late date is another matter. It could only be urged on this appropriation bill as an emergency affecting

the transmission of the electoral vote of the last election; otherwise there would be plenty of time to enact it in the regular way before the next election.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CABLE. This amendment was offered pursuant to a resolution adopted by the committee that has jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Mr. MADDEN. But that does not bring it within the rule. The rule says there must be a "report" on the subject from the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. CABLE. Even if there was no report, as the gentleman indicates—

Mr. MADDEN. Let me make my statement first as to why I think the amendment is not in order.

In the absence of a report from the legislative committee having jurisdiction, the question arises as to whether it would retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill. It would not do for it to retrench expenditures in connection with future elections. It must definitely and positively show that it will reduce the amount of money covered by this bill and not result in a claim against the Government for mileage under section 144 of the Revised Statutes.

Whether it will cut off the mileage of these messengers depends upon the date when this bill becomes a law. The messengers must be appointed by the electors January 12, or soon after. They can start upon their way immediately after their appointment. If this bill containing a change in the law doing away with the messengers should not become a law until January 20 it would then have been possible for all of the messengers to arrive in Washington and have earned their mileage, and the legislation would not have accomplished any reduction, as the statutory rate for mileage would have continued in force. If the bill does not become a law by January 26, with this proposed amendment in it, all of the messengers would have been required to have been in Washington by that date by law, and the legislation would have been ineffective.

It will therefore be seen that whether this amendment will affect a saving in the amount of money covered by the bill hinges upon the date upon which the bill may be approved. If anyone can say that the bill would be approved before January 12, the first day upon which any of the electors would be entitled to choose their messenger, the legislation would be in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? Does not the gentleman know the bill is going to be signed to-night?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I predict that. I predict it will be signed before the reception is over to-night.

Mr. MADDEN. As no one can say when the bill may become a law, the saving to be effected by this amendment is therefore problematical, indefinite, and uncertain, and for that reason the amendment is not in order.

The enactment of this provision on this bill, should it be ruled in order, might result in a very awkward and embarrassing situation for Congress. Suppose the bill does not become a law until the 26th day of January, when all of the messengers are required by law to deliver their votes or be subject to a fine of \$1,000. Take the messenger from the State of California for example. We will say that he was within one day's journey of Washington when the bill became law. He is notified of the change in law on January 25, while en route. He must immediately start back to California so that the certificate in his custody can be sent to Washington by registered mail as the amendment provides. He would not get back to California until, perhaps, the 1st of February, and the certificate would then have to be mailed back to Washington. The amendment provides that the electors shall "forthwith" mail the certificates. If one started by mail and did not arrive, and the other started by messenger and he had to return to his point of starting so it could be mailed, and it was mailed and it did not arrive, it would be the duty then of the Secretary of State to send a messenger to California to get the certificate of the electoral vote of that State from the district judge and return with it to Washington. In the meantime the messenger from the State of California would have earned nearly all of his mileage, for it is computed by law on one way only, the expenses of the messenger of the Secretary of State would have to be paid both ways, and the expense to the Government would not be lessened but increased.

The proper way and the only safe way to reform this procedure now would be the passage of the joint resolution which could be certain to become law by January 12. If it was, then the money in the bill would not be needed and the law would

safeguard the transmission of the returns from the various States, so there would be no doubt about having them here when the hour arrived under the law to count the votes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the earliest date that the gentleman claims the messengers could start?

Mr. MADDEN. January 12.

Mr. BLANTON. And they could not start before that?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio on the point of order.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment comes within the meaning and intent of the Holman rule. In the first place the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has been made on the ground that it is not germane. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that this amendment deals specifically with the same subject matter that is contained in the bill, and that is the transmission of the electoral votes from the place where the electors meet to the seat of Government. Therefore it is germane. In the second place the intent of the Holman rule was to permit the reduction in the amount stated in the appropriation bill, and this clearly reduced the amount to be appropriated by striking out the entire paragraph and saving \$14,000.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has argued that we must know, when we consider the amendment, what is ultimately going to happen to the bill and when it is going to happen. In other words, because no Member of the House can assure the Chair that this bill will be passed by the Senate within a certain time, and signed by the President by a certain time, therefore the amendment does not come within the Holman rule. But in my opinion the Holman rule is intended to include the facts set forth in this amendment. It is the effect of the action by the House alone irrespective of what happens in the Senate or the White House that should govern. This clearly reduced expenditure; it certainly reduces the number of persons who are to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. I have enough faith, too, that if the amendment is adopted the Senate will promptly pass it and send the bill to the White House, so that the messengers to be selected next week will know whether they are to come and to be paid.

In that connection the Secretary of State is authorized to wait for the receipt of the electoral vote until the fourth Monday in January, and then if they do not come to send a messenger for them. So the messenger who comes from Washington, from Oregon, or from California need not leave the place where the electors meet for 10 days from date, and if the House should adopt this amendment the messenger could be notified to wait, and the Secretary of State could do that and see what would happen in the Senate, and surely the Senate, if the amendment was adopted, would act promptly in order not to put the messengers in an awkward position.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what has been said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE], it is merely a matter of calculation to see how much money will be saved by the amendment. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio the expense of making these returns would come within the sum of \$20. It could not go over \$20 for the proper stamping and registration of these certificates, whereas if the amendment is not adopted it will cost the people of the United States \$14,000. That retrenchment certainly brings it within the Holman rule.

As to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said about the bill probably not being passed in time, I can not agree because it could be signed to-day. What has this bill done here in the House of Representatives to-day? It has sidetracked the Army appropriation bill. The Army appropriation bill was under consideration. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was able to come in here and shunt that bill aside and bring up his \$157,000,000 deficiency bill. Why? Because he knew he was going to pass this bill to-day. The bill could be passed in 30 minutes and go promptly to the Senate, and they could pass the bill before sundown. The gentleman knows exactly how expeditiously these deficiency bills are handled. This is a very small, seven-page bill. The Senate could pass this bill this afternoon, and the President of the United States could sign it to-night, and this amendment would mean saving nearly \$14,000 to the Government and to the people who are taxed to pay the money.

As to the question raised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that it is not germane, What is there about the amendment that is not germane? We admit that it changes

the law. Of course it does. That is the very purpose of the Holman rule. It is to permit a change of law when it saves money to the taxpayers of the Government. This does save money. Why is it not germane? What is this paragraph about? It provides the manner of returning these three certificates by the electors in each State. It merely provides that instead of a messenger coming all the way from his home to Washington to deliver a little paper, as they did when it was necessary a hundred years ago, when there were no mail facilities, when we did not have modern mail deliveries, that that little piece of paper shall be delivered by mail.

I say this to the Chair, and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], that if there is one particular little thing connected with the action of Congress that brings it into disrepute at home with the people, it is the present ridiculous mode of sending election returns to Washington.

The people know of the favored messenger who gets a special trip to Washington, who enjoys himself while he is here. These messengers attend fêtes and entertainments by the various delegations. They go back home and tell what a fine visit they have had, at 25 cents a mile, to be borne by the taxpayers at home. The people at home laugh at us for letting this law stay on the statute books, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] for his zeal in seeking to change this law. It ought to be changed, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] does not permit it, because usually he is an economist of the first water.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, about four years ago, January 27, 1921, I introduced a bill seeking to change the methods of bringing up these election returns and proposing some other rather comprehensive changes. In April of the same year I introduced a bill modifying in some details the first bill. In February of last year the bill was reintroduced, and on the 3d of this month I introduced a bill limited solely to the method of dealing with the returns from the electors. I believe, therefore, I may be able to make some statement which to some degree may clarify this whole question.

An examination of the law, the Constitution, and the statutes discloses some very interesting things with reference to our system. I will not say that there is a hiatus in the Constitution respecting important details in the election of President and Vice President, but such a statement would not be far wrong. There is a very definite conflict between what seems to be the method provided in the Constitution for procedure and the practice, and the whole plan, in so far as legislative plan and control is concerned, depends upon a Federal power over the State executive which does not exist. The Federal law as it obtains to-day undertakes to direct the chief executive of the State as to his procedure with reference to these election returns. The Congress prescribes this and makes the whole congressional plan depend upon the governor's carrying out the congressional mandate. Of course, Congress had no power to do that thing, and yet that is the beginning place in the whole system of the procedure in the functioning of the electors. The Federal law provides that the governors of the States shall issue three certificates as to this election and deliver them to the electors. When the electors cast their vote they in turn issue three certificates. They attach to each of these certificates one of the certificates issued to them by the governor with reference to their election. Existing law directs them to send one of these to the President of the Senate at the seat of government.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] does not change that. There is no attempted change with reference to that procedure. Existing law provides also that one copy shall be delivered to the judge of the district where the electors meet.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio does not seek to change that disposition. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio seeks to change only with reference to the disposition of one certificate, viz: That certificate which under existing law is delivered by the messenger. The Chair will bear in mind that these certificates are duplicates. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio were merely to strike out that language in existing law providing for the transmission of this certificate the method of transmission of which he proposes to change, and were to offer nothing in lieu thereof, there would still be a complete method provided for getting the returns to Washington; first, by mail, and second, if the mail failed to bring the certificates by the fourth Monday of January, then by the hand of a messenger delivering to the President of the Senate, as now provided, the certificate left with the district judge in the district where the electors met.

This amendment proposes to save \$14,000. It seems to me it comes within the scope of the Holman rule, though I make no claim to knowledge on these points. I hope it will be so held. If held in order I will offer a substitute for the proposed amendment more exactly embodying my judgment as to what should be substituted for that part of existing law providing for the service of the messengers. We should not only save this \$14,000 but we should rid ourselves and our procedure of this absurd custom of spending such sums of money to have individuals bring by their hands returns to Washington that have already been brought by the mail, and that everybody in the Nation has known of for months. It makes Congress ridiculous, and justly so, in the eyes of the country. I am not so much concerned as to the effect upon individuals as I am concerned as to the effect upon public confidence in the good sense and the sincerity of the elected agents of the Government. For four years I have pressed the Committee on Election of President and Vice President for action on this matter. I had hoped it would save us from the disgraceful spectacle of again seeing 48 individuals being paid 25 cents per mile to do the utterly foolish thing of coming all the way to Washington to bring up copies of that which the mail had already brought.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has suggested that the burden of proof is upon the proponent of the amendment to show that it will pass within the time limit of the 12th of January. It seems to me that he has reversed the presumptions that are imposed upon him in raising the point of order. There is no presumption that the bill will not pass in time, so that it may be applicable to the situation, and there is, therefore, no burden on the proponent of the amendment to make any proofs of that kind. It seems to me that the burden is on the man who makes the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I am only arguing the provisions of the Holman rule, and what I stated about the Holman rule is the rule of the House. I did not talk upon the merits of the question. I talked about the rules of the House.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I am talking on the rules of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. My colleague does not understand that from the statement just made. I think he has made a statement that does not touch the vital spot.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield for a question; if this bill should pass this afternoon with this amendment in it, and then go to the Senate, and it passes the bill promptly, and it is signed by the President, the Associated Press, the Universal Service, and the United News will have a notice of such action in every daily newspaper to-morrow morning everywhere in this country that these messengers must not start from home on the 12th, that their pay has been cut off, and that they will have to send their certificate by mail, so they are not going to start from home on the 12th.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. We are not considering the amendment now; we are considering the rules of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get one matter clear in my mind if I can have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio. Do I understand the Committee on the Election of the President and Vice President has adopted a favorable report on the bill which the gentleman offers as an amendment?

Mr. CABLE. The Committee on Election of President and Vice President has had up for some time a consideration of this matter. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has had a hearing or two, and I have had a hearing on my bill, and yesterday a motion was passed by the committee instructing me to offer this as an amendment to the appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, I do not think that would meet the situation that is required by the rule; I am not arguing except this one thing at this particular time. I think that which was under contemplation under the Holman rule was that the proposition must have been adopted as a bill by a committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter, and then as such offered as an amendment. I do not believe it was in contemplation under the Holman rule that one legislative committee might simply meet and direct its chairman or any one of its members to offer some amendment to a bill brought in from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order further than to call the attention to a ruling made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] while

Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this particular point. I do not care to argue the merits of the point of order more than to call attention to that ruling as reported on page 498 of the Manual, which is to the effect that despite the question of whether the amendment might be in order or might be germane or reduce the amount carried in an appropriation bill, notwithstanding the point of order would be held good against it unless it was shown affirmatively that the bill had been reported from the committee under such circumstances as the gentleman from Tennessee just stated.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no difference between a motion authorized by a committee and a bill reported out, because in this particular case it is the action of the committee, and that committee has jurisdiction of the matter, and as it reduces expenditure it clearly comes within the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, can the gentleman say definitely that it will reduce expenditures in this bill? Can he say this bill will become a law in time to be taken advantage of to save money?

Mr. CABLE. Positively; because I have faith in the Senate of the United States that it will pass this bill within a week, in order to give the messengers time to know in reference to the matter.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman can not settle this question on faith, but on facts.

Mr. CABLE. I think the burden of proof is on the gentleman from Illinois to show it will not become a law.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress who opposed this resolution, I want to add a word. As I understand the matter this resolution can apply only to the bill of this particular year. I should dislike to have it appear that the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress regarded this resolution as a matter of permanent legislation. We very carefully considered the Holman rule—

Mr. BLANTON. It is affirmative legislation as proposed here.

Mr. GIFFORD. As I understand this particular deficiency bill, it simply applies to the reduction of \$14,000 for the current year only.

Mr. MADDEN. It will apply to this bill; it can not apply to a future bill.

Mr. BLANTON. It changes the law. It says "hereafter," and it will be permanent legislation if it goes in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But it must apply to this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. And in future years.

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps. But that was not my understanding, and I might say that draft of the change in legislation was given but little consideration by the committee.

I could not understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], whether he approved this resolution or not.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CABLE. I will ask the gentleman if we have not had hearings on two different days on this proposition?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I know we have had hearings. The gentleman from Texas appeared before our committee. He has a very lengthy bill which it seems to me ought to receive more consideration. But at the recent meeting of the committee it was a hastily considered matter to place it on this appropriation bill. It might be an excellent thing to save \$14,000 at this particular time, but I for one reserved all rights on the matter, Mr. Chairman, to discontinue a custom adopted in 1792 just a few days in advance of the electoral vote being counted, realizing there is a great deal of pride on the part of those who are already selected in the minds of those people who represent your State to come to Washington on this particular mission. It seems we are taking very speedy action to save \$14,000 on this matter at this particular time.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to note that the Committee on Appropriations is careful to see to it that we do not legislate permanently too quickly on an appropriation bill. We did have in mind the Garrett decision, and we did think there should be a proper report regarding some permanent legislation. If I am credibly informed that this is permanent legislation, I am convinced that our committee has taken too hasty action, and I am pleased to here reserve my right to oppose the measure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the additional point of order against the amendment that it does not sufficiently appear that the proposed amendment was

authorized by a committee having jurisdiction of this particular question as contemplated by the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state at the outset, of course, that in all these matters the question on the point of order must be determined entirely upon the rules and precedents of the House, without any reference whatever to the merits of the legislation.

In order to be in order, this amendment very clearly must come within the Holman rule. It is evident that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

If necessary for the determination of the point of order, the Chair would be inclined to hold that the proposed amendment is germane to the paragraph to which it is offered. The practical questions that have been raised with reference to the possibility of passing the legislation in time to be effective this year would be interesting, but in the opinion of the Chair not necessary to pass upon, in the view that he takes of the precedents.

Clearly the amendment does not come within the first part of the Holman rule, reading as follows:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This clause in the rule follows the sentence reading as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

Then follows the paragraph or the sentence which the Chair just read relative to the three cases in which a retrenchment of expenditures may occur by the methods specifically set out. Following that, however, is this proviso:

Provided, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

In the view of the present occupant of the Chair the important question is whether we have before us the report of the committee having jurisdiction of the proposed amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], as was shown by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] a moment ago, passed upon a similar question on January 16, 1912, when the gentleman from Tennessee considered the language of the proviso and himself used the following language:

The Chair is of opinion that the Committee on Appropriations may not, under the rule, bring in as an integral part of an appropriation bill substantive legislation that if introduced in the ordinary way in the House—that is, by bill or joint resolution presented by a Member—would go to another standing committee of the House for consideration and action; nor does the Chair think that any Member of the House may offer from his place on the floor any amendment carrying such substantive legislation, even though that legislation would retrench expenditures, unless that Member offer it as the report of a committee or as a member of a joint commission which would have jurisdiction of the subject matter under the rules of the House. In other words, the scope is limited, and the outposts are fixed by the rule, to which the Committee on Appropriations may go or to which the individual Member may go.

There is an orderly procedure provided by the rules for the submission of reports of committees. The action of committees may, in a sense, be reported orally to the House in the course of debate for the information of the House, but the Chair hardly believes that that is the action contemplated by the proviso in the Holman rule. When the rules give permission for their violation in exceptional cases, such as this is, and use a term such as the word "report," which has a specific meaning in the rules and in the knowledge of all the Members of the House, it would seem that in the interest of orderly procedure in the House the usual ordinary meaning or construction given to the term should be applied; otherwise, as was done in this case, a committee may hold a meeting and pass a resolution directing the chairman or some member to offer an amendment on the floor of the House, without having in the usual way passed upon the legislation and submitted a

legislative bill with a report setting forth to the House the reasons for the recommendation of the legislation. The Chair admits that the question may be a little close, but on the whole the Chair is of the opinion that this amendment does not come before the committee with a report from the committee such as is contemplated by the proviso in the Holman rule. It is to be noted that paragraph 2 of Rule XVIII requires that "all bills, petitions, memorials, or resolutions reported from a committee shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed."

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CABLE. Irrespective of the action of the committee and the designation given by the Chair to the statement contained in that part of the Holman rule providing that the amendment is in order if it reduces the amount of money covered by the bill, I submit that in this particular case it reduces the amount of money and it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that means a reduction of the amount of money for the particular purpose involved in the appropriation. In this case the gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which changes existing law but does not necessarily reduce the amount of money that may be expended for the purpose mentioned in the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. CABLE. It reduces it from \$14,000 to nothing by striking out the \$14,000 provision and that is a reduction of that amount.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say that no one can say it reduces the amount carried in the bill, because they do not know when the bill will become a law, and the messengers may be on the way before this bill is passed and signed, in which case there would be no reduction in the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. A question which is pertinent to the statement the gentleman makes. How could the House ever exercise its rights under the Holman rule unless it could guarantee to the House what the action of the Senate would be and what the action of the President on the bill would be?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, on fiscal bills which do not become a law until the 1st of July it would be easy to predict.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The House, though, must take action on an amendment, if the statement of the gentleman is to be construed as authorized by the Holman rule, only when it can guarantee to the House that the Senate will concur in the action of the House and that the President will sign the bill; otherwise it could never become a law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say, with reference to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio, that in order to come within the first part of the rule it must appear clearly that the reduction in expenditures would apply to the current appropriation or the appropriation before the House and not with reference to future expenditures in connection with the matter of substantive legislation which is passed. And in that connection it is somewhat significant that even the proponents of this amendment, while they propose to amend section 140 of the law relative to presidential elections and to repeal section 145, take no action with reference to sections 141, 142, 143, and 144. In that connection the Chair will read section 144:

Each of the persons appointed by the electors to deliver the certificates of votes to the President of the Senate shall be allowed, on the delivery of the list intrusted to him, 25 cents for every mile of the estimated distance, by the most usual road, from the place of meeting of the electors to the seat of government of the United States.

That section will remain in force, and very properly so, because if the proposed legislation should not be passed in time to affect the return of the votes by the messengers, they could come in for a deficiency appropriation thereafter.

On the whole the Chair can not escape the conviction that the rules contemplate a more formal and more definite action by way of report upon legislation from a legislative committee than is contained in the mere direction to the chairman of a committee to present an amendment after an appropriation bill is ready for action in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 2, after line 11, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION"

"The General Accounting Office is authorized to credit the accounts of the disbursing officer of the Public Buildings Commission in the amount of \$180 heretofore expended by the commission for the maintenance of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen will recall that the Public Buildings Commission is charged with the duty of investigating the amount of space occupied by various activities of the Government, with a view to reducing space wherever it is possible and conserving public money in the way of rent. That commission, I think, was established in 1919 and there are Members of the Senate and Members of the House on the commission. The duty of the commission requires a good deal of travel to various portions of the city daily, for the purpose of looking into space occupied and demands for space which constantly arise. That service has been performed by the secretary of the commission. Practically since the commission was first established in 1919 he has been using his own automobile for that purpose, and in December, 1922, the commission voted to allow him \$20 per month for the maintenance of his automobile, the purchase of gas, and so forth. He began to draw that \$20 a month from the commission's funds in January, 1923, and drew it up to and including September, 1923. In October, 1923, he was advised that the accounts of the commission for that particular purpose had been rejected or denied.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Our committee had this question before it for consideration after the commission had ordered the payments made, and we notified them we would not allow any further payments.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And this amendment proposes to pay him the amount spent before that action was taken?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. The secretary drew the money and this amendment simply proposes to authorize that his accounts be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, in the public prints of Saturday afternoon and Sunday there was broadcast a very interesting statement from a distinguished citizen of South Carolina and a lifelong friend of mine with which I desire to take issue, more in sorrow than in passion.

The leading daily in my district carries it with the headline, "Coolidge better Democrat than party leaders, says DIAL." This does not definitely state whether he is a better Democrat than the balance of the Republican leaders or the Democratic leaders, but when you come down to the meat of the matter, he does not keep it in the class of leaders. Had he done so, I probably would have had nothing to say. I would have left the Democratic leaders to take care of it, and, being only an humble but a faithful private, would not have said anything about it; but I find that the distinguished gentleman says that Coolidge is a better Democrat than the Democratic Members of Congress, and he does not even exclude those of his own State of South Carolina.

I will discuss in a moment some of his reasons for this statement. I want to parenthetically remark there are seven Members from South Carolina, all of whom are embraced within the denunciation contained in this article, some of whom are certainly political friends and personal friends of the distinguished gentleman, and they were all elected by the Democratic primary of South Carolina, and yet when we come to the general election, Mr. Coolidge only got 3,000 votes in the State out of something like 100,000 probably voting. The gentleman who makes this statement did not succeed in getting a renomination himself from the Democrats. I do not know whether that is the reason he said we are not Democrats or not, but he assigns his reasons. He goes into the question of the verdict of the people last fall, and says

it was against the Democratic Members of Congress and not against Mr. Davis.

The gentleman says we have been shambling around with shame-faced compromise and running after bolshevism, and, finally, the reason he knows the Democratic Party in Congress has gone to the bad and that the party is in need of a receiver—and, in fact, to take the gentleman's statement, you would think it was in need of an administrator de bonis non almost—the reason for it, he says, is that we have been beaten twice and by heavy majorities.

Well, now, the gentleman and I have been training for many years in the Democratic ranks. We were beaten in 1888 and in 1896 and 1900 and 1904 and in 1908, and yet my distinguished friend never found it necessary to declare the Democratic Party was wrong because it got beat. He still continued to trail after the flag, and I was with him, and we stood shoulder to shoulder many a day when the outlook was entirely hopeless.

This is one of the reasons which he assigns for the fact we are out of business—we were wrong because we are beaten. Well, then, I should say that the gentleman is evidently wrong, because he got beat in South Carolina last year. I do not say this to rub salt in any sore, because I voted for him and did what I could to enable him to come back to the Senate.

The gentleman says another thing that I want to deal with just a minute. In one of the publications which I have at hand he says:

Let us manfully realize the truth that we are beaten because we deserve to be beaten, because by our own weakness and cowardice and errors we have alienated public confidence.

Now, that is rather strong language and that is attributable to the Members of Congress, because he says we are the ones who are responsible. It is attributing to the Members of Congress from South Carolina, which had honored him, that degree of political cowardice which he can not substantiate against a Member that South Carolina has sent here in the last decade.

Were we cowardly when we took hold of the great financial question that had been agitated ever since 1865 and for which a remedy had been sought by every great party; when we took hold of it and solved the financial question of this country and established what everybody admits is the greatest financial system of the world to-day in the Federal reserve act? That was not a cowardly action or bolshevistic.

Were we cowardly when we met the demands of the agricultural people of this country, long denied and long sought, and established the farm-loan system which enables the farmers to finance themselves by pooling their own obligations and selling them on the market at a better price than the bonds of the United States frequently sell?

Was the Democratic Party cowardly when it cast defiance into the face of the Imperial German Government when it said, "You can send one ship to England, once a week, at one certain port, but you must give us notice beforehand"? Were they cowardly when the President of the United States, backed by the Congress of the United States when he called on them from this platform, met the issue and replied to the Imperial German Government that the seas are open to American commerce and American citizens and they will be protected by every power that this great Government and this great country can put behind the force that protects them? Was that an element of cowardice in the Democratic Party? And when we went through that cataclysmal struggle such as had never engulfed the human race before and came out with the scalp of the Kaiser, with the destruction of imperialism in Germany, and with the assertion and maintenance of the rights of the American people all over the world to go where they pleased, when they pleased, and conform to no man's dictum except the law of the land where they are; was that Democratic cowardice? [Applause.]

The gentleman says we are wrong because we are beaten, and yet immediately after the triumphal conclusion of the most remarkable effort of a military character that the world has ever seen, the Democratic Party was beaten at the polls, and forsooth, he would have you believe it was beaten because it was cowardly when it had faced the odds which I have spoken about.

Then he calls us to repentance. He is a combination of John the Baptist, who is preaching, "Repent ye, repent ye"—I do not know whether the kingdom of heaven is at hand for him or not—and of Elijah, who got back in the mountains and said, "There is nobody left but me." He is a combination of those two Biblical characters.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I want to call attention to the fact that so far from selling our birthright for a mess of pottage, when it was proposed in the Mellon bill to cut the taxes of the rich people 50 per cent, and the taxes of the ordinary folks only 25 per cent, the Democratic Party—which he characterizes as cowardly and bolshevistic—the Democratic Party held steadfast with an even keel, and laid down the rule which, with some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, we wrote into the statute books, a provision that did even-handed justice to all, although they did not indorse the Mellon plan urged by Mr. Coolidge, who was a better Democrat according to this gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Oh, yes; where is the evidence of cowardice, where is the evidence that we have gone bolshevistic? Let the gentleman specify, and when he specifies we will call for the proof. The indictment is a skeleton indictment and has no substance in it, and on behalf of the delegation from South Carolina of the House I want to say that it is unfounded and we resent the implication that we have ever been debasing our democracy here in this hall where South Carolina has always stood without fear as being loyal to the Democratic Party and to the Democratic principles. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I have spoken about Elijah. On yesterday in another body when they were called upon to choose between the Executive favor and the right of a million or more of hard-working employees of the United States Government, where was this gentleman, who thought Coolidge was a better Democrat than the rest of us, found and where will he be found on the same issue to-day? Will it develop that we are all left out and only he is left on the Lord's side? It took a still, small voice to comfort Elijah, and it comforted him. I am asking if there is some still, small voice somewhere who is giving comfort to this legislator and enabling him to feel better after he goes out of office. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing the last item in this bill a while ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], who is responsible for the statement on this floor that the adoption of the Inland Waterways Corporation bill at the last session would not mean an appropriation of \$5,000,000, asked me if after his bill passed it was not true that from that time to this this corporation has been a money-making proposition for the Government. I told him I would undertake to find out what the facts are, and I have done so.

In December of last year the Warrior River division of this service lost \$23,950, according to this account. The depreciation during that period of time was \$3,500, making a total loss for the Warrior River division in December last \$27,450.

During the same period of time the Mississippi River division of this service lost \$50,000, according to this report. During that same period of time they charged for depreciation \$22,250. The Mississippi River division of this service, therefore, lost during December \$72,250. Both divisions of this service during the month of December lost in round numbers nearly \$100,000. That is only on items for operating expenses. It evidently does not include interest and matters of that kind.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. In making this statement has the gentleman the facts or is that only an assumption?

Mr. RAINEY. I have the report here filed by General Ashburn. In the course of this method of accounting he subtracts depreciation from net losses. That can not be done; you must add it. That is an amateurish method of keeping an account. This account, if it means anything, notwithstanding the juggling of figures, for the month of December, which is a profitable month on the Mississippi River when grain is moving South and coal is moving North, the losses were practically \$100,000.

For each month the Warrior River service from the time this bill passed until the last day of December—and this account stops then—the Warrior River service lost all the way from \$32,000 a month up to \$57,000 a month. It never was operated at a profit. And to that you have to add the depreciation figured out which still further increases the loss. Now for the months of October, November and December, when they had

water in the Mississippi River, the Mississippi River lost as much.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is it not a fact that the Mississippi River was lower during those months than for many, many years past?

Mr. RAINEY. But the Goltra barges were operated at a profit. They operated at a profit when the Mississippi River was lower than usual.

For two or three months in 1924 this Government Mississippi River service showed a slight profit, but the depreciation charges just about ate up the profits in every instance. Therefore I say to my friend from Massachusetts that his bill incorporating this proposition did not prove to be the alchemy he thought it did. The losses continued just exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. The only answer made so far to my exposition of this situation was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. MADDEN. Was the gentleman reading from the hearings?

Mr. RAINEY. I was depending upon the account stated at the gentleman's request a while ago; yes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] is an ardent water advocate, but no more ardent than I. I have voted for every river and harbor bill presented to the House since I have been a Member of it. I believe in barge service on the rivers. I believe it is the service which will ultimately prove profitable on our rivers, but this service has been grossly mismanaged and it is a terrific failure. It reflects upon the Members of this House who have voted for it. It is a step back in the direction of waterway improvement and water navigation. The only answer made to my exposition of this account so far is an attack upon a private citizen in the State of Missouri, who is trying to operate boats in opposition to the Government service on the Mississippi, and who has been charged with not operating them. Of course he did not. As soon as these boats were turned over to him under his contract he applied to the Secretary of War for a rate. He must do that. The Secretary fixed his rate, and the Secretary could not fix it higher than the rail rate, and if the Secretary could have done that he would have done so. He gave him the rail rate and said, in effect, "These Government boats are operating at a rate 20 per cent below the rail rate and we do not want you to compete with them. Therefore, you must operate at the rail rate." Who can operate barges on a river carrying freight in opposition to railroads at the same rate? It can not be done. While he was protesting and asking for a rate under which he could operate they seized these boats on the 25th day of March, 1923, just as soon as he got possession of them. The reason for the seizure was that the boats were not being operated as a common carrier. They could not be. They would not let him do it. Then commenced this series of lawsuits which have cost Mr. Goltra and his associates I do not know how many thousands of dollars to get these boats back from the Government.

The seizure of these boats was an act of piracy without parallel in this country, and the gentlemen who are responsible for it are going to hear from it in the future in the courts. He did not get them back until last September. During all that period of time the Government operated these boats. I think the boats were in the condition the gentleman from Missouri says they were, but they were not in that condition because of the operation of those boats by Mr. Goltra, but because of the Government operation of the boats. He has been engaged since he got them back in repairing them as rapidly as he can and getting them into service. If two of them are not now in the service it is because he has not had time to repair them. They are in bad repair. The Government operated these boats, and if they are in bad repair, and the gentleman from Missouri is right about that, then it is the Government that is responsible for the situation. He is now operating the boats and carrying wheat since last September down the river, and whatever he can get up the river, without a rate. The aluminum interests of America have tendered him bauxite to carry up the river. The Government boats are carrying bauxite for the aluminum company. Finally, last week he succeeded in getting a rate on bauxite, the same rate that the Government

boats are permitted to charge, with this proviso, that he could carry only the bauxite that the Government boats could not carry. Is not that the kind of competition that will drive boats from the river? They take the boats from him and operate them themselves, and then finally when he gets them back through the courts they say to him that he can carry bauxite, but that he can carry only the bauxite that the Government boats can not carry.

The friends of waterways in this country, those who want to make a record along that line, would better vote against this appropriation, because this Government service is discouraging the initiative of individuals on these rivers. In spite of all of these efforts upon the part of the Government to crush the enterprise of a private citizen, to make impossible the demonstration that he is trying to make with his money, Mr. Goltra and his associates are convinced that those barges can be operated at a profit, and he is now demanding that his contract with the Government be closed, that appraisers be appointed under the contract in order that he may take over these boats and operate them. Against the Government fleet? Of course. He has to operate them against everything else. He is operating now against all of the force and power of this Government that is willing, apparently, through its committees to pour \$5,000,000 more into this losing enterprise. No wonder it loses. Do you gentlemen realize that money is being furnished without interest—\$600,000 of that money—to cities along the Mississippi River for the purpose of building terminals? This is money contributed by the taxpayers of the country, and it is being loaned without interest to these cities, immense sums of it. Altogether, \$865,000 has been loaned.

The Government operates those wharves for the cities, paying the expenses of operating them, charging it up as a part of the overhead expenses of operating the boats. Then this Government corporation permits those cities to collect wharfage rates from whoever uses the wharves. There ought to be an account stated here—an accurate account certified to by a competent firm of accountants, and when that is done it will astonish every man in this House. When they were loaning the city of Vicksburg, without interest, money with which to build wharves, and when they were permitting that city to collect wharfage rates, they advanced the city of Vicksburg \$1,100 on account of freights that might afterwards accrue in some way. That is a part of this account.

This account runs through as far as it is disclosed here in that sort of way. There may be no objection to the Government building wharves along the Mississippi River and giving them to these cities. It might result in increased navigation of the rivers and be for the benefit of the entire country, but if the Government does do it for nothing the Government ought not to permit those cities to charge wharfage rates and to make an income out of that kind of an investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. [Applause.] I believe a good deal of good may come from this discussion. Because of my experience in water transportation I know that as far as the Government should go is in providing channels, deep water, and leaving the transportation end to individuals and corporations. I know that in my experience—and I have had a whole life's experience in it. I have conducted, if I may mention myself, several corporations; when one fails it is because the men taking hold of it do not understand the business. When you take Government operators and give them positions because of some political influence they may have, some favoritism, to do work they have no knowledge of, it means a loss, of course. And then if they can come back to the Government and ask for money, either directly or indirectly, to make up the sum that they have lost because of their lack of the knowledge of the business, it is something that should be discouraged in this country.

I know from long experience that all you need in any place for successful water transportation is sufficient water, and the gentlemen who attempt to operate this route and get their tugs through give an illustration right there of their lack of knowledge of the business as they did not have the proper tugs for handling the business. I might say the concern of which I am the largest owner has various kinds of boats. We have small boats carrying 600 tons in, say, 10 feet of water. We have others boats that will carry 1,500 tons in certain kinds of water. It depends upon the width and length of that boat and its carrying capacity. The same way with tugs. There are certain deep-water tugs that go out of New York Harbor that draw very heavily, draw probably 12 feet of water or 15 feet of water. There are other tugs that go in parts around the district of New York and up the Hudson

River to its upper end that draw only 6 feet of water. The people who build these tugs and boats are familiar with the kind of water the tugs require in the various localities where they are required. I am only mentioning that as proof that the Government never should go into the transportation business or for that matter in any other regular business on its own account. They should leave that to the men who have given a life of service and who know every detail of it; who know the kind of boat they need here and the kind of boat they need there, and never attempt to start without the knowledge requisite to make it a success. I think that applies, perhaps, to nearly all the operations. I think this great country of ours that grew up and built roads from the Atlantic to the Pacific should dig out its streams, but water transportation, which is one of nature's transportations, has been developed by individuals. All we ask in that respect is that the Government shall deepen all these streams sufficient for the interest of navigation in all the various States and localities where these streams run. The Government should stop right there, and as soon as it does that there is sufficient enterprise and plenty of money and plenty of men in this country who know how to operate water transportation without making a loss or without asking any Government help. There should be no way they should get any help except through their own good management. That is the way to do it. Gentlemen, I do not care to take up any more of your time. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will allow us to proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Wait until we reach the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to recognition.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I withdraw the demand at this time.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two statements in this debate undenied which ought to be explained before we appropriate this \$3,000,000 in the last paragraph of this bill. When the act of June 3, 1924, was passed, permitting the Government to engage in the barge transportation, I understood that the prime purpose of that legislation was to furnish to the people cheaper rates of transportation, and yet we have the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], undenied, that private operation, Mr. Goltra, for instance, could have carried commodities on the Mississippi River on barges operated by him 20 per cent cheaper than the Government barges, and yet he was denied that privilege by the War Department. If that is so it is an indictment against the legislation and this \$3,000,000 ought not to be appropriated.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. He asked permission to carry at 20 per cent less than the railroads were carrying, and the Government barges were carrying at 20 per cent less than the railroads. The permission was refused, because they did not want him to compete with the Government barges.

Mr. BLANTON. Then he was not permitted to carry the same freight that railroads carried at 20 per cent cheaper?

Mr. RAINEY. Except as to sand and ore and coal.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; excepting sand and ore and coal. If that is true, it is an indictment against this legislation, because I understood it was intended ultimately to furnish cheaper transportation to the people.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] said that there was an indebtedness against this business of \$17,000; that he went with the managers of the new concern, as taken over by the Government under the new corporation, to the officials of St. Louis, who held this indebtedness of \$17,000, and to collect it they discounted it \$8,000. In other words, they took \$9,000 in settlement of a \$17,000 claim behind which the Government of the United States was with a \$5,000,000 authorization of appropriation. He ought to explain that, because if so left up in the air in the Record it would lead some of us who are not intimately acquainted with this particular item in this bill to draw wrong conclusions. If individuals or if officers of a city like St. Louis have discounted a \$17,000 debt against the Gov-

ernment \$8,000 and accepted \$9,000 in settlement, it is the first instance of the kind I have ever heard of. I feel like the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY], that the only thing that the Government of the United States ought to do on inland transportation is to furnish the deep water and let the private individuals and private enterprises and private business do the rest. We ought to take the Government away from this transportation proposition on land or water.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. I thought God Almighty furnished the water.

Mr. BLANTON. Sometimes He does; sometimes He does not.

Mr. McSWAIN. It is always furnished down in my district.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but the Government is furnishing water in many places besides the arid West.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and, Mr. SNELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate, having proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the bill (S. 1898) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes, returned to the Senate by the President of the United States with his objections:

Resolved, That the bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senate present not voting in the affirmative.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To pay the widow of William S. Greene, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, \$7,500.

To pay the widow of Julius Kahn, late a Representative from the State of California, \$7,500.

To pay the widow of Edward C. Little, late a Representative from the State of Kansas, \$7,500.

The foregoing appropriations shall be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 2, after line 20, insert the following:

"For payment to Martin C. Anson for expenses incurred as contestant in the contested-election case of Anson against Weller, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1, \$2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, at the last session of Congress, before we adjourned for the summer, the Weller allowance was recommended and appropriated for. The committee certified Mr. Anson's expenses, amounting to over \$2,300, but we are only authorized to make an appropriation of \$2,000, and that is what we have reported in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: On page 2, after line 20, insert: "Executive. For expenses of the agricultural conference assembled by the President in November, 1924, and for each purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, including such travel expenses as may already have been incurred by the members of the conference, \$50,000, to remain available until June 30, 1926."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It should follow the amendment just adopted?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. I do not think there is any doubt about its being subject to a point of order, but I would like to make a statement in connection with it.

All Members here understand that the President some time in November appointed an Agricultural Commission to study the problems of agriculture, with a view to reporting some

method by which those engaged in agriculture could be put upon a better financial basis. The President appointed a commission of distinguished men from different sections of the country, and these men have held several meetings. Each meeting involves an expense of about \$1,000 for travel. There are also other expenses connected with the work.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Let me make this statement, and then I will yield.

The President made a request on the Committee on Appropriations for an appropriation of \$50,000. The committee itself realized that it had no legislative authority to report an appropriation, and the chairman of the committee took the question up with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture called a meeting of his committee, and I understand that committee acted favorably upon a resolution which it has not yet reported to the House, recommending the appropriation provided for in the amendment which I have just offered. I realize that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I also realize that this is a very important matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is willing to make this appropriation because the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has recommended it?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I would be willing to make it in any case because of the importance of the subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman support what was commonly termed the "Mary Haugen bill," which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture brought in here on the floor?

Mr. MADDEN. No; the gentleman did not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then there are some things which come from the Agricultural Committee that even the gentleman from Chicago can not indorse?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I want to say in justice to the Committee on Agriculture that I took this question up with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and requested him to act upon the question, so the Appropriations Committee might have authority to appropriate the money requested by the President for a very important purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the farmers of the country that this \$50,000 is a little mite which they can get from the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, does the gentleman make his point of order?

Mr. ASWELL. I trust the gentleman will withhold it.

Mr. BLANTON. I withhold it.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wanted to have it understood why we did this.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a brief statement with reference to this matter. I do not propose to stand in the way of anything that might be done for agriculture, but I think there are some facts that should be stated.

In the first place, the President had no authority whatever to appoint such a commission, and I would call the attention of the committee to two facts. Two years ago the Congress authorized a commission to investigate the farmers of America. It was a commission composed of the ablest Members of this House. They studied constantly for more than six months and made an extensive and elaborate report to the Congress. They found that the farmers were in a bad fix, and stated that fact. That ended it. They expended more than \$25,000 during that investigation. Last year President Coolidge, in an effort to win the support of the Northwest as the election approached, appointed another commission, composed of Frank Mondell and Eugene Meyer. They went to Chicago, at public expense, and established headquarters. They returned, and the papers heralded their coming as saviors of the farmers, coming back to tell the President of the United States what relief should be forthcoming. They reported that they found the farmers were still in a hell of a fix and stopped at that. The President of the United States sent a message to the Congress immediately and stated that the bank failures in the Northwest were caused by poor banking and that the bad fix of the farmers was caused by poor farming and lack of diversification. Then, as the campaign approached, the President announced that he would appoint another commission to investigate the farmers again. Without any authority from the Congress, without any sanction or consideration or discussion by the Congress, he appointed a political commission composed, no doubt, of high-grade gentlemen. But I submit that this Coolidge commission,

representing organizations, as it does, could not possibly know as much about the agricultural conditions of this country as the Committee on Agriculture of this House, which is responsible for agricultural legislation, and certainly could not know more or tell anything which would add to the information that the House Committee furnished two years ago. The President has appointed this commission for the specific political purpose of producing an alibi for Mr. Coolidge and a lullaby for the farmers of America. [Applause.] That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Now, gentlemen, I, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, shall not oppose the passage of this amendment, because I want Mr. Coolidge and his administration to have every opportunity to render some service to agriculture, which they have made no very serious effort to render. They have brought bill after bill of bunk and radicalism to this House Committee on Agriculture with no serious purpose of action. They have never permitted a sane, constructive measure for relief to reach this House for consideration. And I want to say, gentlemen, that it is little short of an outrage to raid the Treasury even of \$50,000 and then run throughout the country loudly shouting common sense and economy.

This commission—hear me—can not and will not report any legislation worthy of consideration for this session of the Congress and has no intention of any such purpose. Nor does President Coolidge himself intend to bring anything worth while to this Congress. It is a political camouflage which every Member of the House and every citizen of the Republic, especially the farmers, should resent. Unless the administration can discover and bring something to this body that is worth while, scientific, sound, and practical, it will be \$50,000 thrown away for political ends. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman from Texas will reserve his point of order I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate everything my good friend from Louisiana has said and I appreciate the spirit which prompts the point of order made by our friend from Texas, but I want to appeal to my friend from Texas to be practical. You have got to face a condition. It will serve no useful purpose to criticize the Executive for creating a commission which was not authorized by law. The President has done it. I think the most practical thing for us Democrats to do, I will say to my friend from Texas, is to pursue the course we have pursued for four years, willing to join this administration in any effort it makes to solve the agriculture problem, whether we have faith in the sincerity of the effort or not, so they can not say we blocked them in doing it.

Now, I have great respect for the personnel of that commission. I think I know what will happen; I think I know the benefit or lack of benefit that will come. But let me suggest this to my friend from Texas: You are living and you have got to live for four years under a political organization which frankly went to the country and got the country to accept its philosophy, which is what? That Congress is either incompetent or else it is deficient in character, and that you have got to have a bureaucratic system of government to handle affairs.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In my judgment, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] did more for the farmers of the United States when they defeated the McNary-Haugen bill than all this commission will do put together.

Mr. WINGO. I am going to come to that, my friend; but here is the point I am talking about: You have got to live for four years under a bureaucratic system of government, which openly says it wants to get rid of Congress at every opportunity and will not call it in extraordinary session because it has not the capacity or character necessary to discharge its functions, and that the President and the bureau should administer the Government.

Now, the administration admits that this Republican Congress can not do anything to solve the farm problem. Of course, that is supposed; and I suppose the President in figuring on it says, "The Republican Congress in the last session wrestled around here and brought in the 'Marie Hogan'

bill, and even the Republicans would not support it," and they went out to the country and attacked the Democrats, and said, "They killed it." What else do they admit? They admit that this Republican Congress is incompetent.

They admit this Republican Congress does not know what is the matter with agriculture and therefore know they have not the capacity to get together and offer a solution, and so I guess the President said, "It is hopeless; I have got a Congress on my hands, even though it is of my own party, and it can not do this. It has fallen down. There is not enough brains in the Republican Party," I suppose the President said, "and in the House of Representatives to agree upon a practical solution of the agricultural question"; and the poor man, in his desperation, said, "I will just get a little commission of my own. True, the law does not authorize it, but who is to prevent me? I will create a commission and I will tell that Republican Congress down there to give me the money," and I suspect he said to my friend the gentleman from Illinois—although, of course, I do not expect my friend from Illinois to violate his confidence, but I can imagine the President saying—"Now, look here, MADDEN, of course you agree that the 'Marie Hogan' thing was bunk, and you and the other real Republican leaders were disgusted with your colleagues, but they fell down, and the only thing your Republican Congress can do is to give me the money and I will hire somebody on the outside with brains who can give me a solution"; and I can hear the old, hard-headed gentleman from Illinois say, "All right, Mr. President; I guess it is cheaper to go outside and hire some brains than it is to depend upon this Republican Congress"; and I guess the gentleman from Illinois has acted wisely. Therefore I join with him in begging my friend the gentleman from Texas please do not take away the only hope the farmers have. The President admits he can not depend on a Republican Congress. He says he has got to go out and get this commission, and we have to assume the President is honestly trying to help things, because he says he is the friend of the farmer, and you must believe that. So please do not shut the door entirely in the farmer's face. It is admitted that a Republican Congress can not do anything, and if the President can find a remedy by the establishment of a commission for \$50,000, it will be cheap. [Applause.]

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. I intend to make the point of order, but if the gentleman desires to speak I will reserve it.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman from Texas is going to make a point of order, I hope he will make it now.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, of course everybody who is familiar with agricultural legislation in this House knows that the appointment of this commission by the President was a political move. He gave notice to the country as soon as he was nominated that he was going to establish this commission and, of course, waited until after the election to appoint it.

Ever since the Republican Party came into power in this House in 1918 they have been throwing legislative sops at the farmer, and the farmer has been getting poorer and poorer all the time.

You passed your wonderful emergency tariff bill on agricultural products and wheat went down immediately. In order to fool the farmer further the President increased the tariff on wheat from 30 cents a bushel to 42 cents a bushel immediately before the election and in the same week wheat went down 7 cents a bushel. Then you passed your intermediate credits act. Then you waited until the closing days of the last session of Congress, just before the election, and brought in the famous "merry Hogen" bill, and after that was defeated on its merits here, because some of us tried to do something for the farmer instead of something to him, a great many of the Republican nominees went over their districts, especially in the Northwest, and cursed the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] and myself because we happened to be Democrats opposing this bill, and stated that the Democratic Party had defeated the bill.

You now come into power after the 4th of March with an increased majority. You are going to have a majority after you have kicked out the progressives, which you say you are going to do and which you have already done in the Senate, and yet notwithstanding your undisputed majority you know that you do not propose to reconsider the McNary-Haugen

bill. If it was good at the last session of Congress, it ought to be good after the 4th of next March.

So here is an agricultural commission appointed for political purposes only. The President of the United States appointed it without any authority of law, and "great economist" that he is in the expenditure of the money of the people, he is coming here and asking this Congress to appropriate \$50,000 of the taxpayers' money out of the Treasury to defray the expenses of this commission, and we know that when that report is made it is not going to be worth the paper it is written on, with all due respect to the personnel of that commission. I would not give the judgment of the members of the Agricultural Committee of the House for all the commissions the President may appoint.

You know that when an administration promises the people to do a thing which it knows it is not going to do, like they have done with respect to the American farmer, it immediately appoints a commission. It is simply an alibi for the President of the United States and a sop and a lullaby for the American farmer, and that is all it will ever amount to.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman ever found one benefit that the people of this country ever received from the \$400,000 coal commission that was created?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Certainly not.

Mr. BLANTON. We are paying more for coal right now than we were when the commission was organized.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Absolutely; and when that commission was appointed every bit of information it ever desired pertaining to the mines of this country was already down here in the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. BLANTON. And they have spent the money, and the people are taxed to pay it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Absolutely.

The Republicans are overwhelmingly in the majority, and you have the responsibility. If you want to do this, it is all right. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I am not going to oppose it. I am not going to make a point of order, but I say to you the time is coming when you are not going to fool the American farmer any longer, and prosperity is never going to come to the farmer of this country as long as everything he has to sell he sells in a world market and every manufactured product he has to buy for himself and his family, including his farming implements, he buys in a protected market.

You talk about the prosperity of the farmer. Read the statistics from your own Department of Agriculture. Every month the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar is growing less, and the farmers are going into bankruptcy all the time, and yet you propose to quit on the 4th of March when we all know there will be no legislation for the benefit of the American farmer.

If you want to benefit the farmer, decrease your tariff rates and increase the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar that he already has instead of trying by some *modus operandi* to give him extra dollars to purchase products at a prohibitive price.

It is up to you, gentlemen of the Republican side. I do not propose to make a point of order, but the time will come when you will have to meet this issue. The American farmer is not going to be fooled much longer. You are going to be overwhelmingly in the majority in both the House and the Senate, with a Republican President, and yet when this commission shall have rendered its "great" verdict it will go like the coal commission and all other commissions that have been created and made investigations at a cost of thousands of dollars of the money of the people of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think that this proposal may be fairly and legitimately characterized as a bit of pure political bunk. In the last Congress, the one before this, there was created a joint commission composed of representatives from the two legislative branches of the Government, branches in which after all legislation must originate. That commission, commonly known as the Anderson commission, worked for a period of nine months, as I now remember it, and I think it is fair to say that probably it made the most exhaustive investigation that has ever been made in the history of this country, and made it along nonpartisan lines, into the condition of agriculture and into the condition of the farmers of the United States. They made their report. Nothing has come from it.

A year or two ago, under the direction of the President of the United States, another commission went forth. Gentlemen who were in an official position—a former leader of the House

of Representatives was one of them—constituted a part of this commission. They went about in the West and they made a report. I recall nothing whatever that has come from that.

This, I understand to be an administration proposal. During the campaign just ended no promises along any specific line were offered by the President in regard to agricultural legislation—all that was said was that a commission would be created. That has been done, and now we are asked to appropriate the money to pay for that commission. Personally, I do not feel disposed to take the responsibility of interfering with this Republican administration's proposal, but I wish to predict now that no more will come from this commission than has come from these commissions in the past. As a matter of fact, that which has run through such indefinite and hazy recommendation as the President of the United States has seen fit to make touching the betterment of agriculture has been with respect to cooperative marketing. If that be the proposition, you need no commission to study that question. The Congress has now abundant data upon which to inform itself to proceed with legislation along that line without interposition of the unofficial commission now proposed to be made official by an appropriation of \$50,000 out of the Federal Treasury.

I understand this, as I say, to be an administration proposal—the only thing the Republican President has to offer. I do not care myself to take the responsibility by a single objection of preventing its consideration. Upon its merits I should feel constrained to express my own idea and preserve my own integrity by voting against it, but I am willing to give the House an opportunity to pass on the question. I reiterate again the prophecy that this \$50,000, or such part of \$50,000 as may be expended, will be that much money absolutely wasted; that it will be of no benefit whatever to Congress in dealing with agricultural legislation. It is merely carrying out a promise made by the administration for campaign purposes and is paying this political campaign promise out of public funds. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, representing a farming district, as I do, to save for the farmers of this country the \$50,000, I make the point of order that this is legislation and unauthorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

For the purchase of capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation created by the act approved June 3, 1924, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RAINEY: On page 7, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the item in the bill which appropriates \$5,000,000 for the Inland Waterways Corporation, and I have just moved to strike it from the bill. During the progress of this discussion in the committee I have been discussing this item, and these are the charges I have made, and this is the proof I have submitted, and until the present time there has not been a word of denial.

In the first place I charge that this bill which created the Inland Waterways Commission obtained its place on the calendar at the last session of Congress, because the Committee on Rules understood that there would be no appropriation. The chairman of the Committee on Rules so stated on this floor. That stands uncontradicted. I have charged also that this bill, coming as it did from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was under the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], the chairman of that committee. I have read the discussion which occurred between myself and himself on the floor of the House on the 16th day of last May, in which he called me to order and told me that the passage of this bill would not mean an appropriation, that it simply meant that this organization was to be effected in order to enable this corporation to borrow money, and that was all.

Therefore, I say that the committee that reported this bill out did not understand that it meant an appropriation or they would not have reported it; and the Rules Committee, which gave it a place on the calendar and made its passage possible, understood that there was no appropriation; if they had, they would not have given it that place. Therefore, those who advocate this bill do not come now before this committee with those clean hands they ought to have in order to get \$5,000,000 more out of the Treasury of the United States.

This account submitted by the director or president, or whatever you call him, of the Inland Waterways Corporation shows, if it shows anything, jumbled and juggled as it is, that for the four years of its operation the corporation has been operated at an average loss of at least \$5,000 per day. The evidence shows it, and it can not be denied. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] insists that since they were permitted to borrow money it has been operated at a profit. I have called attention to the report that shows that in the month of December last, when freights were most abundant, it was clearly operated at a loss of nearly \$100,000, and how much more I do not know. The service has been operating at a loss since that time, with only a slight profit during one or two months, and the depreciation wiped out that and made it a loss.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman kindly refer me to the authority for the statement of losses since last July?

Mr. RAINEY. It is in the hearings.

Mr. WINSLOW. I know, but I can not find it. I want to be accurate about it of course.

Mr. RAINEY. If the gentleman will turn to pages 113 and 115, he will find the tables which sustain the statement that I have made as to the losses since that time. The only achievement yet made by this service is the elevation of an Artillery officer of inferior rank to the rank of brigadier general of the United States. That is all we have got for all of the money that we have poured into this enterprise. They started into it with a gift from the Government of the equipment they used. As to that I have charged, and it can not be denied, they proceeded to get appropriations from the Government of over \$2,600,000, and they have spent all of that. After the organization of the corporation last June, which enabled it to borrow money, they have borrowed \$650,000, and they have lost all of that. Now they ask \$5,000,000 more to be poured into this losing enterprise, and the only other thing that this demonstration has accomplished is that it is driving from the rivers the craft that navigate the rivers. This corporation operates probably 200 barges and I do not know how many towboats. I know that anybody who wants to sell any antiquated, out-of-date barge finds a good angel in the Artillery general who operates this corporation. He buys it and adds it to this fleet. Every time he buys anything he adds to its depreciation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, this juggled account here deducts from losses depreciation and calls the balance "money out of pocket." I do not know what that means, but I know that from your losses you can not deduct depreciation and state an account accurately. You must add depreciation. This account proves that if you give this brigadier general enough equipment, all he wants, if you give him this \$5,000,000, he will show a profit, because the depreciation will be so great, according to his method of keeping this account, that there will be a profit, because the bigger the depreciation the more they make. It is charged up here as profits. Do you tell me that you can run that kind of an organization and can do it right? We have selected now an advisory board under some provisions of the act, and as I look down the list I think I know nearly all those gentlemen. They are eminent business men; they are large shippers, most of them on this river. They have a personal interest in this subject.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. About having a personal interest, I would like to understand the facts. Suppose there should be profits made?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not mean that.

Mr. BLANTON. Would not those profits go into the Government Treasury?

Mr. RAINEY. If there should be any, they would, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. Then these gentlemen would not profit by that?

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, no; certainly not. They are interested in shipping on the river. While these accounts show these tremendous losses, they particularly call attention to how much the shippers have saved, and the shippers on the Warrior River have saved something like \$400,000, while the shippers on the Mississippi River have saved over \$3,000,000. At the same time,

the Government has lost seven or eight million dollars. That is an inviting way to state an account, is it not, and then ask an appropriation of \$5,000,000. No man can afford to vote for this appropriation and defend his position afterwards.

Mr. MADDEN. This appropriation calls for \$3,000,000.

Mr. RAINEY. I know it does, but the act permits \$5,000,000, and they will soon be back for the other \$2,000,000. I was saying that in spite of these losses this corporation under the direction of General Ashburn has advertised to the people and advertises here in this report, which was submitted to the gentleman's committee, that they have been operating at a profit to the shippers of \$3,000,000 by giving these alleged reduced rates on the Mississippi and over \$400,000 on the Warrior. Three million four hundred thousand dollars have been saved to the shippers, but while they have been doing that, if they have done it, and I do not believe it, they have been swamping and destroying \$9,000,000 worth of equipment. They have absorbed \$2,600,000 that they borrowed before this corporation was organized. They have absorbed \$650,000 since that time, and they are going right now to absorb \$5,000,000. Is it not time to stop this in the interest of navigation on our rivers? No man is a more ardent advocate of waterways than I. I have voted for these barge propositions always, except that I did not vote for the bill last winter, because I saw what was coming. I yield to no man on this floor in my belief in the future of river transportation. I think the time has come when river transportation is about to commence, and therefore I am against this proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will be able to limit debate on this proposition. Many gentlemen wish to get away early to-night. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes and that a vote be taken immediately at the close of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, and that at the end of that time the vote shall be taken in the committee. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not expect to have a roll call in the House this afternoon?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. WINGO. But simply to get to a point where it is ready for a roll call in the House if necessary?

Mr. MADDEN. If it gets to a point where we have that sort of a situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in view of the nature of the opposition to this provision of the bill before us it is a very difficult matter for me to make a proper reply. It is quite impossible for me now to discuss the nature of the opposition to this bill when it passed last May. About all there was to it then, as I was impressed, was an effort to fry the fish of an individual living in St. Louis who did not want this bill to pass. Just now there seems to be a kind of resurrection of that same old controversy and there seems to be forced into the argument, if it is an argument, a further reference to the tribulations of this same man, Mr. Goltra, of St. Louis. Of course, I would not for a moment take advantage of a man who is not here and who can not strike back, notwithstanding his name, and so forth, have been dragged in more or less by the heels as an argument why the Congress of the United States should not go on with its avowed purpose of testing out inland waterway transportation. Whatever he is, however much he is, or how little he is, however many or how few barnacle-covered barges he is holding, either by force of the Government or the courts or whatever it may be, we as the people and the Congress of the United States are deeply interested in the problem of inland water transportation, and it is to that matter we should devote our attention. This subject of the Mississippi Barge Canal Corporation as a whole was before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for days. We had a great number of witnesses representing parts of the country from Texas north to Minnesota and there was no one, as far as I remember, and my memory may be a bit faulty, who offered any opposition to the formation of this barge company under the provisions of the bill as it now stands except Mr. Goltra.

He came before the committee met one morning and undertook to tell me as chairman what the committee should do and

that he would eat the committee alive if it did not do so. He was told that in a regular way he would have a hearing, and he did that morning. Later in the day, at half-past 6 o'clock p. m., he came again and told what he was going to do to us and what would happen if the bill was reported out favorably. I presume he believed all he said. I do not contradict him and I mention this fact merely to show there was a personal feeling of some sort on his part which may have had a warrant or may not, but from the very fact he expressed himself I can not regard him as a very dependable witness so far as the consideration of the appropriation of this money is concerned. My good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], who paid me a compliment this morning for which I thank him, has gone into that most difficult question, namely, that of accounting. It takes a good man, well trained, to read an account when he sees it. I have yet to find a man who has not been well trained or who has been well trained who as a rule can understand an account when it is read by anybody, and particularly by a man who clearly is not himself familiar with accounting methods. Now, I have not been able to find tables in the report which Mr. RAINEY has properly referred me to, to enable me in the time at my disposal to say to what extent there has been a profit or loss on the operation of this canal system during the time since the present barge corporation has been doing business. But I can tell him a little bit about the strictly cash condition. When this bill was passed in May the old barge outfit had a miscellaneous floating indebtedness of about \$850,000. Since then the new corporation has paid off that floating indebtedness and reestablished a new floating indebtedness of \$650,000, banking on the credit to which the corporation was entitled by virtue of the legislation which led to the formation of the new corporation. By the same token, the present corporation is entitled to a great deal more credit at the banks and can obtain it without going to the United States Treasury at all. Mark you, they owed Tom, Dick, and Harry, everybody almost in Christendom, under the old system about \$850,000.

To-day the new corporation owes no miscellaneous debts, and when I say "no" I do not mean absolutely nothing to a cent but virtually nothing except bills current. They now have \$100,000 in cash on deposit. They have \$225,000 to \$250,000 on account of accounts receivable, and they owe \$650,000 to the banks. Subtract this \$100,000 in cash from the \$650,000 which they owe on bank notes and they have about \$550,000 net cash obligations. I am not taking the property valuation but the cash condition. They have in a few months gotten themselves together, started along, reduced the cash obligations by about \$290,000, and yet they have not gone to the Government for money.

The purpose of Congress clearly was not to go into business. My good friend from New York [Mr. CLEARY] has emphasized the importance of keeping this Government out of business. To that I would utter a good old-fashioned Methodist "Amen." I believe in that absolutely. But here was a situation which was so bad, a condition so intricate, that nobody could determine whether or not the inland-waterway scheme would be an advantageous commercial undertaking. We had it under the War Department in a fragmentary and unsatisfactory form, and we had it under Mr. Goltra, hit or miss, speculating, it may be, on Government barges; I do not know. But we had no well-organized institution trying to demonstrate to the people of the country whether or not a properly managed and properly equipped barge company could operate such business at a profit.

We have not gone into new fields. We have continued the Black Warrior River system, which had been operated during the war for war purposes. We have continued the Mississippi River system as far up as St. Louis, which has been operated for some time, and for the present we have not operated on the upper Mississippi, although such is a part of the contemplated program. The Government did not want to tackle it. The War Department did not want to continue the barge operations. The Secretary of War did not want to tackle it. There was a time when some suggested, "We want five years in which to work this out." Our committee had various people before us about that. Finally the committee and Congress came to the conclusion that we had better not fix a definite time in order that we would have no handicap in effecting a sale in the event of successful demonstration of inland-waterway service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, is it possible for me to get a little extra time?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes of the time that was allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time here was fixed.

Mr. WINSLOW. The chairman of the committee in charge has yielded me two minutes of the time allotted to himself.

The matter is of course involved with little details very much like the little details connected with any business from a peanut stand up. It is not easy to understand all about it in a minute. The losses have been growing less and less, and if you dig out a little here and a little there in the report or apply to the barge corporation you will get a good idea of the improving financial condition. We have already arrived at a point where we can run this barge proposition well much of the time.

The question is what to do with this \$3,000,000, which is three-fifths of what may be appropriated under the bill. We are in the middle of the stream. We need certain types of tugs and barges in order to meet the all-year-round flow of business. We need more barges on the Mississippi in order to make prompt and proper connections with the terminals along the river. On the Black Warrior River there is a question of a terminal at Birmingham, a question of making an arrangement of some sort or other to extend that trade and make it proper to meet growing commercial demands of the country. I could go on and show you the legitimate uses for this money asked of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] has just submitted, I think, some facts and strong business reasons which fully answer the arguments of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] in opposition to this appropriation. A careful survey and analysis of the speech of the gentleman from Illinois will show that he has largely indulged in generalities, rather than concrete facts.

When you find the Mississippi Valley Association, representing, as it does, the chambers of commerce and the large business interests throughout that wide section, and when you further find that the business organizations and interests in the States of Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia are in full accord with the Mississippi Valley Association as to the importance of giving at this time financial aid to the Inland Waterways Corporation, so that it can more efficiently maintain and operate this barge test which the Government is now making on the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers, then surely Congress will be slow to disregard such advice and indorsement by voting with the gentleman from Illinois in denying this appropriation. The indorsement of the interests to which I refer is not perfunctory and casual, but is the result of a most careful study of the needs of the barges, now being operated by the Government on these rivers, and it is the belief and judgment of this representative business group that this appropriation, if made, will put the barge service on both rivers on a paying basis when the additional equipment can be procured with the funds herein provided.

I recognize that it is important to secure further action by the Interstate Commerce Commission, looking to a readjustment of rates, especially a fairer division of joint rates for the waterway service. Let us not understand that when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] refers to shippers on the rivers that these shippers are limited to those adjacent or near to the Mississippi and Warrior. Shippers deriving benefits from the barge service on these rivers cover a wide territory, extending hundreds of miles from the rivers and far out into many of the interior States.

In some instances the barge service is far more beneficial to shippers distant from the rivers than those whose business is located immediately on or near the banks. Take the territory served by the Warrior and you will find that cities like Atlanta, Chattanooga, Nashville, points in Texas and Florida are greatly interested in the continuance of this barge service, and I may say that one of the things that the Inland Waterways Corporation is now intensely interested in is the securing of better rates to Texas points—especially to and from Galveston.

No one has claimed that this barge service has consistently in the past paid profits on either the Warrior or Mississippi, but the failure to pay profits on one or both of the rivers—even with very inadequate equipment—is due not to bad management but to conditions which the Inland Waterways Corporation is powerless to remedy in the absence of the financial aid from the Government which this appropriation seeks to

supply. As stated by other speakers, the low water in the Mississippi at certain seasons of the year has made it impossible for some of the improperly constructed towboats to be operated; the unfair division of rates between the water and rail carriers has also been pointed out, as has the total inadequacy of present equipment, and the incompleteness of many of the terminals. Certainly, all who have given any study to the matter have found that on the Warrior inadequacy of equipment and an unfair division of rates are alone responsible for the losses there shown.

If time permitted, it could be pointed out that, on many commodities carried up the Warrior by the barges, the total amount received for transporting the same by river is paid to the railroads for a comparatively short haul, and there are a few instances, where the total amount received has been even insufficient to pay the short-haul rates of the railroads. I mention this in order that you may understand how important it is that the Inland Waterways Corporation be now provided with funds vigorously to prosecute their claim to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a fair division of joint rates.

The Secretary of War is known to have expressed himself frequently in opposition to Government ownership or to permanent Government operation of this barge service; yet he strongly indorses this appropriation because he recognizes that only in this way can any real value be given to the property now owned by the Government on these rivers and that only in this way can the barge test demonstrate to the business world that it can be made to pay and thus enable the Government later to sell its equipment on some fair and remunerative basis.

Disinterested auditors have appraised the property now owned by the Inland Waterways Corporation—which all understand is a Government-owned corporation—at an amount approximating \$10,000,000, and the \$3,000,000 carried in this bill will provide additional and modern equipment now needed to put barge operations on these rivers on a paying basis. When the indorsement of the Secretary of War is reinforced by the approval of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Mississippi Valley Association, and every chamber of commerce and business organization that has expressed itself on the subject, then, surely, this should furnish to Members of Congress sufficient evidence to justify the appropriation.

Some reference has been made to the directors of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and it was suggested that they favored this appropriation, because, perhaps, they were shippers and might be interested in the lower rates that the barge service promised. Now, these directors are outstanding business men, who are serving without pay, and who did not seek the place, but whose appointment was urged and recommended by the business interests in that large territory to which I have referred and where the beneficial results from barge operations have been carefully studied and are known. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hesitate very much at this late hour in the afternoon to undertake to add anything to the arguments that have already been suggested in favor of favorable action upon the pending bill with reference to this inland waterways transportation.

I thoroughly concur in the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] that probably it is an unsound governmental policy from an economic and political standpoint for us to advocate legislation here looking to permanent Government operation and control of public utilities. But, gentlemen, in the consideration of this particular question we must not lose sight of the fact that this proposition, like that of the property of the United States Shipping Board, as an illustration, necessarily presents exceptions to that rule. It is not proposed by the friends of this legislation or by the friends of the operations of the inland waterways service that the Government, as a permanent policy, shall go into the operation of these barges. Everyone who is concerned affirmatively in the temporary operation of these Government utilities bases his argument upon the emergency proposition.

This is property in the main that the Government has inherited from war-time operations. It was thought wise to undertake to demonstrate, and to demonstrate successfully, whether or not transportation upon the inland waterways of the country could be successfully conducted. The Government has spent tremendous sums of money already upon the utilization and development of the Mississippi and the Warrior Rivers, and we have in this property which we are now discussing an instrumentality which is absolutely to test the wisdom of whether or not we shall hereafter appropriate large sums for the improvement of our inland waterways.

It is not a proposition involving permanent Government ownership and operation of these utilities. We hope ultimately, and at an early date, for the Government to sell this property to private operators, just as we hope—those of us who have taken a particular interest in the merchant marine of the country—that the time may soon come when the Government can sell to private operators the great merchant marine that the Government now owns; but we have to consider the situation with which we are confronted, and we have got to realize that until the time comes when private operators will operate our Government ships that the Government, as a matter of protection of their own property, and in the public interest, has got to undertake that operation. This presents an analogous situation.

The question now is whether this very valuable Government asset shall be made a success by improving and making available the instrumentalities it ought to have or whether we will go ahead and continue to make an effort to operate this barge service with very defective and very inadequate equipment. If there is any one thing, gentlemen, in my opinion, in which the people of this country economically are most vitally interested, it is the question of transportation. I verily believe that the only real hope by which the shippers and producers in this country can secure any reduction in the transportation charges is in competition with the waterways against the exorbitant railroad charges. It has been demonstrated before you in the figures furnished by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] the absolute advantage of the great Mississippi Valley and of the Southern people by the figures where you have in operation, although operated by inadequate equipment and in a somewhat haphazard fashion because of the physical situation—you have had demonstrated the value of the inland water competition in reducing the exorbitant transportation charges of the railroad. This is purely a business proposition, gentlemen, and it seems to me that the recommendations of the Secretary of War and of the board of business men and the Committee on Appropriations ought to result in an affirmative vote. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the replies which have been made to the speeches I have made on this subject. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] insists that there was no opposition to this proposition, except from Mr. Goltra, and that he is an interested witness, and we ought not to consider what he says. I have not referred to Mr. Goltra for a single particle of proof that I have furnished to this committee. I have referred always to the account furnished by General Ashburn, and which appears here in these hearings. Nobody has denied that the account, as stated by him, does not show what I have said it shows—a loss of at least \$5,000 a day on the average for four years the boats have been in operation.

I submitted to Mr. WINSLOW, who, interrupting me, came down into the well of the House and asked me where I found my information as to the losses during every month following the act of June last, authorizing this corporation to borrow money. I gave him the pages of the record. He went back to his seat and I presume is satisfied. It shows that during every month since, and including last June, this service was operated at a loss sometimes of \$100,000 a month. There is no question about it. The evidence shows it and no gentleman on the floor has denied it.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] I am unwilling to believe is so unacquainted with the facts in his own State as would appear from his speech on the floor. This effort to sustain this \$3,000,000 appropriation consists in attacking Mr. Goltra. He says Mr. Goltra has some Government property under contract to purchase and he is holding it out of operation and that it is depreciating in value on account of rusting out at the riverside. He is not holding it out. It has been in use. He says Mr. Goltra is having some trouble with a coal company over a coal shipment. What has that got to do with this bill?

This corporation seized Mr. Goltra's barges and boats and used them ever since these barges and towboats were in condition to be turned over. They seized them after they refused to make him a rate, holding them for over a year. After the barges were turned over to him to operate, the Government seized them and operated them; and they are in a bad condition, but the Government is responsible.

Then comes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], my friend, who never offends anybody on this floor, who is always plausible, who advances this overwhelming argument that this appropriation ought to go through because the chambers of commerce in cities that have been getting the

benefit of this graft, or think they have, are for it; because the Mississippi Valley Association is for it; and therefore it ought to go through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there have been losses in the operation of these boats. Nobody denies that, but if you want to prevent the losses then the thing to do is to supply the facilities which this appropriation provides for. You can not run a boat drawing 8 feet and 6 inches of water where the water is only 6 feet deep. That is the way they are making the losses. It is to correct that trouble that we are providing this money—to build boats that will be light enough draft to run on the river at low water.

Now that is the situation. For nine months every year the evidence shows that when the water is sufficiently deep to float the tugboats money is made, and for three months when the water is too shallow to float the tugboats they lose the money that they have made the previous nine months. The question is, Do you want this thing to succeed, or do you want it to fail? If you want it to succeed you will defeat the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. RAINEY], and if you want the transportation facilities to be taken away from the people in that section of the country you will adopt his amendment.

That is all there is to the story. It is just a question of providing facilities to make a profit instead of sustaining a loss, and the way to make the profit or to provide means by which profit can be made is to adopt this provision of the bill. If gentlemen do not want that to be done, then they should adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8906) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, with a Senate amendment thereto, and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the bill H. R. 8906, with a Senate amendment thereto. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to concur in the Senate amendment. The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS, STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 62) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, for the establishment of judicial divisions

therein, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and I ask unanimous consent to disagree to all of the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 62, to create judicial districts within the State of Indiana, and asks unanimous consent that the House disagree to all of the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from Pennsylvania conferred with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], or anyone on this side, advising him that he was going to take this up?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that he was spoken to, but I did not do that personally.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from his knowledge of the attitude of the gentleman from Texas toward the legislation is sure that this will be agreeable to him?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am quite sure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRIFFIN, for to-day, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, \$17,000 (H. Doc. No. 536); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, to remain available until June 30, 1926, for the expenses of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, \$50,000 (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a statement of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10904) granting a pension to Samuel Andrew, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8206. A bill to amend the Judicial Code, and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeal and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 1656. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the La Plata River compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. S. J. Res. 135. A joint resolution granting permission to the Roosevelt Memorial Association to procure plans and designs for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. J. Res. 316. A joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the expenses of the agricultural conference assembled by the Presi-

dent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 11282. A bill to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 11354. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTERSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9969. A bill for the relief of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation for losses incurred by reason of Government orders in the construction of battleship No. 42; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8294. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Sappington; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 11354) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 11355) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey by revocable lease to the city of Springfield, Mass., a certain parcel of land within the Springfield Military Armory Reservation, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 11356) to repeal the act of January 27, 1922, providing for change of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11357) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the public domain lands reserved by public proclamation as national monuments, and validating any such restorations heretofore so made by Executive order; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 11358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel restricted fee patents covering lands on the Winnebago Indian Reservation and to issue trust patents in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11359) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of competency removing the restrictions against alienation on the inherited lands of the Kansas or Kaw Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11360) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of a certain 40-acre tract of public land in New Mexico for the use and benefit of the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11361) to provide for exchanges of Government and privately owned lands in the additions to the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz., by Executive orders of January 8, 1900, and November 14, 1901; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11362) to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of certain lots in the town of Cedar City, Utah, for the use and benefit of a small band of Piute Indians located thereon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11363) to restore to the public domain certain lands within the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 11364) to provide for the attendance of the officers of the several executive departments and independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices during the sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK: A bill (H. R. 11365) to establish a national military park at Fort Stevens, in the District of Columbia, and to authorize the acquisition of such lands as may be necessary to preserve said fort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11366) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 11367) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near its junction with the Allegheny River, in the city of Pittsburgh, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 11368) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11369) to authorize the widening of Harvard Street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 11370) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11371) for the improvement of commerce and navigation and to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain public works in the Illinois River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CABLE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 37) relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FISH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) adhering to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHAFER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) providing for the appointment of a joint committee of Members of the House and Senate to investigate and study the conditions in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 11372) granting a pension to Mania Vartanian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 11373) for the relief of H. V. Stovall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 11374) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bierley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 11375) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Allendale School, Lake Villa, Ill., two condemned bronze or brass mortars or two 6-pounder or two light 12-pounder bronze guns, with their carriages, and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11376) granting the distinguished-service cross to Roswell Hays Fuller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11377) for the relief of Martha E. Esterly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 11378) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Roebuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 11379) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Hambaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11380) granting an increase of pension to Emsey O. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 11381) for the relief of Charles B. Kitzmiller; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11382) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11383) granting a pension to Edward B. Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11384) granting a pension to Hannah J. Van Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 11385) granting a pension to Jesse M. Leverton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11386) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 11387) granting a pension to Nora Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 11388) granting an increase of pension to Nellie M. Withee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11389) granting a pension to Emma L. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 11390) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11391) for the relief of Harry McNell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11392) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Ginn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11393) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Gale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 11394) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Presho; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 11395) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11396) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Neighbors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11397) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Pardue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 11398) granting an increase of pension to Josephine McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11399) granting a pension to Mabel C. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 11400) granting a pension to Dora Brueckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 11401) granting an increase of pension to Alice R. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3364. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Stanton Park Citizens' Association, urging Congress to add to the Capitol Grounds the land between the Capitol and the Union Railway Station; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3365. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Army and Navy Union, of Elmira, N. Y., urging an increase of pension for Civil War veterans and also favoring the passage of House bill 5934; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3366. By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of citizens of Ravenna, Ohio, against the passage of the Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3367. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of R. Elmer Townsend, Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 745, known as the game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3368. Also, petition of Walworth Manufacturing Co., Boston, Mass., recommending an appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission which will be adequate or somewhere near the amount they have estimated, namely, \$7,400,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3369. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of residents of Reedsport, Oreg., to the House of Representatives not to concur in the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) nor to pass any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3370. Also, petition of residents of Yamhill County, Oreg., to the House of Representatives not to concur in the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218), nor to pass any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3371. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, from the first district, protesting against the interference with religious liberties and opposing Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3372. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Hampton, Iowa, asking early passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3373. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany House bill 11021, granting a pension to Mary J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, January 7, 1925

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8906) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 62) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, the establishment of judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HICKEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEXICAN NATIONALS ADMITTED INTO THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Labor (submitted in response to Senate Resolution 202, agreed to June 5, 1924), which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, January 6, 1925.

Hon. ALBERT B. CUMMINS,

President pro tempore, United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CUMMINS: In response to Senate Resolution 202 of June 5, 1924 (received to-day), I have the honor to report that during the 12 months ended June 30, 1924, 93,889 persons were admitted to the United States from Mexico, of which number 89,336 are classified as immigrant and 4,553 as nonimmigrant.

The records of the department are made up on a monthly basis, and since the resolution passed June 5 did not state whether the figures desired are to begin with the calendar month of June 1 or the succeeding month, the figures for the 12 months ended with the fiscal year June 30, 1924, are used as a basis for this reply.

I shall be glad to furnish any additional information desired by the Senate at any time that I may be called upon to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

BLATTMANN & CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that in naming the conference committee upon Senate bill 555, for the relief of Blattmann & Co., a mistake was made; and the Chair substitutes the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] for the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE].

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF INDIANA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 62) to create two judicial districts within the State of Indiana, the establishment of judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SHORTRIDGE, Mr. ENST, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.